A

DEFENCE

Of the

MEMORIAL of the REFORMATION,

Againſt the Exceptions of

Presbyterian Prejudice diſplay'd

BY AN

Hearty *Wellwiſher* of the *Eſtabliſh'd Church:*

WITH

A Particular ENQUIRY into the Authors and Abettors of the *IRISH* Maſſacre.

A VINDICATION of Mr. *Baxter*, and others, with Reference to the Story of the Marquis of *Antrim*, againſt the Accuſations of Mr. *Thomas Cart* of the *Bath*, in his *Iriſh Maſſacre ſet in a clear Light.*

AND

A DETECTION of the Forgeries publiſh'd by Dr. *Hollingworth*, concerning Mr. *Henderſon*'s *Recantation*, and *Character of K.* Charles *on his Death-bed.*

By *BENJAMIN BENNET.*

Ne quid falſi dicere audeat, ne quid veri non audeat, ne qua ſuſpicio gratiæ ſit in ſcribendo, ne qua ſimultatis.

CIC. de Orat.

LONDON:

Printed for J. MORLEY, at the *Croſs-Keys* in the *Poultrey.* 1723. Price 2 *s.* 6 *d.* bound.

THE PREFACE.

ALL the occaſion I have for a preface, and the deſign of this, is to make an apology to the reader, for troubling my ſelf and others with a defence againſt a book ſo mean and inſignificant, that to give it its juſt character, would be thought an indecency in one ſo much concerned in it as I am. I muſt own, I did not apprehend this gentleman's complaints would prejudice the credit of the MEMORIAL; and yet I had reaſons that determined me to take notice of them; which I the rather do, becauſe ſome paſſages mentioned by him, have been objected againſt by perſons of a much ſuperior character; particularly thoſe relating to the Iriſh maſſacre, and the ſtory of the Marquiſs of Antrim. I have therefore examined theſe more fully, and have taken this opportunity to fulfil a promiſe I made ſome years ago, viz. to conſider what Mr. Cart, of the Bath, has ſaid upon that ſubject; who, I underſtand, ſince the writing of what concerns him, and the diſcovery of the preſent Jacobite plot, has thought fit, among other Wellwiſhers, to withdraw himſelf.

The manner of writing will, I'm afraid, be thought too ludicrous, and I'm ſure 'tis what I take no pleaſure in: But I ſenſibly found on this occaſion, the truth of that of the poet,

Difficile eſt ſatyram non ſcribere.

Had Mr. Wellwiſher *(for that is the moſt diſtinguiſhing name I have for him) put on more of the gentleman, the ſcholar, or the chriſtian, I ſhould have paid him all the regard due to him; but as he has done nothing but rail and trifle, he muſt thank himſelf if I have ſometimes treated him accordingly.*

A DE-

A

DEFENCE

OF THE

MEMORIAL, &c.

THE worthy perſon that knows his own name, and who has given himſelf the trouble to anſwer, as he calls it, *The Memorial of the Reformation*, will, I preſume, think me obliged, if not in juſtice to my ſelf, yet in civility to him, to take ſome notice of his performance; and the rather, becauſe he intimates, *p.* 1. what he has undertaken is of mere grace. The *Memorial*, he obſerves, has made its ſecond appearance in the world, and yet, to his great ſurprize, none have vouchſafed it the favour of an anſwer: Therefore he at laſt, in his greater condeſcenſion and goodneſs, reſolves to do it; and I muſt not be ſo defective in point of manners, as not to pay him my acknowledgments.

I own

I own the method of diſpute this gentleman leads me into, is not the moſt grateful. When controverſies come to defences, replies, and rejoinders, there's generally ſo much of the cavilling humour in them, that little fruit or entertainment is to be had from them, unleſs a man love ſcolding: However, I have ſomething to offer to encourage the reader's expectation, provided I be as good-natur'd as Mr. *Wellwiſher*; for he tells me, "That he "hath kept within the bounds of chriſtian charity, and "if he has treated me with freedom, it was no more than "the nature of the thing neceſſarily required; and if I "be a man of candour, he's confident I will forgive it. (forgive his keeping within the bounds of chriſtian charity, and uſing no more freedom than was neceſſary! who would not forgive this?) "That he has not defended "his cauſe in an unbecoming manner, has not puſhed "things to extremities; nay, that ſome will think he "has been too ſoft and tender, *p.* 94, 95." So that when I have given the reader aſſurance, that I purpoſe to follow ſo good a precedent wherever I can, and if poſſible to exceed this charitable man in his good qualifications, I may venture to invite him to hear a friendly debate, managed with all the calmneſs, meekneſs, and candour, that becomes impartial enquirers after truth; may promiſe him, that he ſhall not be diverted from the merits of the cauſe by quibbles, perſonal reflections, or any of that rudeneſs, that often gets into debates of this kind, and not only diſgraces the authors, but diſappoints and affronts their readers.

But tho' ſuch be the excellent temper of Mr. *Wellwiſher*, and ſuch the manner of his performance, (as he aſſures us, who may be ſuppoſed beſt to underſtand himſelf, both name and thing) yet it unhappily fell out, (which I think proper to give the reader notice of, that he may not complain of being decoyed with fair words) that the whole was not compoſed by the ſame charitable hand. The *Wellwiſher*, it ſeems, did his part *at his idle hours*, as he tells us, *p.* 2. and, alas! while he ſlept, an enemy came

came and ſowed tares; ſome peeviſh ſoure bigot, wholly ignorant of the laws of diſputation, deſtitute both of manners and ſenſe, and that underſtands nothing but to throw dirt, and talk impertinently, *This ſame dull creature*, and intruder, foiſted in a multitude of ſcurrilous paſſages, interlined what my friend had writ *mildly and charitably*, with the moſt reproachful epithets, as *infamous bigot*, *fanaticks*, *knaves*, *fools*, &c. This incident, I confeſs, may occaſion ſuſpicion to the reader, that the controverſy will not be all pure argument; in the mean time, to give him what ſatisfaction I am able, I promiſe him when I have to do with the good man himſelf, I'll conſider what he ſaith, with all ſuitable candour; return all his civilities; and I know it can't be taken amiſs, if I now and then talk freely with the ſlanderer, eſpecially if there be no more freedom uſed, *than the nature of the thing neceſſarily requires.*

Beſides, the decent manner in which my anſwerer hath treated me, I mean, where he himſelf is concerned, the work it ſelf affords ſome encouragement. He anſwers my book its true, but has in great tenderneſs paſſed over above 98 parts in 100, as I am pretty confident would appear, ſhou'd any beat the pains to compute the pages, or how much the ſeveral paſſages he quotes from the *Memorial*, put together, amount to, and compare them with the *Memorial*; and as for the little he attacks, he has been ſo very ſparing and merciful in his arguments, as will make the defendant's province very eaſy; he himſelf gives an intimation of this, *p.* 1, 2. when he ſays, *he employed only a few idle hours about it*; whence I may reaſonably hope, making all due allowance for difference of genius and acumen, that a few hours, eſpecially *diligent hours* may be ſufficient on my part; and who would grudge theſe, to have the pleaſure and advantage of converſing with a learned man all the while? The whole paſſage is ſo bright, that 'tis pity to deprive the reader of the entertainment of it. " I hope, *ſaith he*, it will not be thought loſt labour, " or impertinent, if I throw away ſome few idle hours,

" in

" in conſidering a performance, which, I give the author " my word, is ſo far from being unanſwerable, that to " any one who reads it without a byaſs, it muſt, in the " main, appear a ſufficient anſwer to it ſelf, *p.* 1, 2." An adverſary that lies at catch, would be ready to cry out of blunders here, and then go on to numbring, as (1.) Labouring in idle hours. (2.) The labour will not be loſt; and yet the hours thrown away: idle hours of labour thrown away, and not loſt! (3.) The labour not loſt, in anſwering a Book that anſwers it ſelf: were ever idle hours of labour loſt, if theſe were not? (4.) If it be not a blunder, its not very wiſe for a man to conceal his name, and yet expect the author ſhould take his word, that his book is not unanſwerable. As things go in the world, 'tis thought prudent to know a man before we truſt him. But after all, this is a ſmall matter, and ſhall break no ſquares between us; for tho' the author of the *Memorial* never talks of his book being unanſwerable, yet ſince this gentleman has been pleaſed to give no other proof of the contrary, than his word, he is willing to accept of that, and wait for ſomething further to another opportunity. The reader will excuſe me, if I lay before him the remaining part of the paragraph, that if he hath not this admirable pamphlet by him, he may, by reading a good long paſſage together, ſee the author ſhining in all the beauties of his wit and ſtyle. " And tho' I will not take upon me to write an " anſwer to every particular which is juſtly liable to ex- " ception, for then I might ſwell out an anſwer to a much " greater bulk than the book it ſelf, and by that means " impoſe too great a pennance, both upon the reader, and " my ſelf, yet will be ſo free with the author, as to tell " him, that there are an infinite number of particulars, " which I ſhall take no notice of, very much deſerving " to be thrown into the number of his errata, if his " book comes to another impreſſion, and he'll favour his " readers ſo far, as intirely to forego all pretences to infal- " libility, and draw up a table for that purpoſe." Tho'

I have

I have all due regard for the fine thought that runs thro' theſe curious periods; yet, methinks, here are ſome things that wou'd afford remarks; *he won't write againſt every particular*; and what occaſion for that, when the book, in the main, is a ſufficient anſwer to it ſelf? It would certainly be loſt labour to throw away idle hours in ſuch work; *this wou'd impoſe too great a pennance upon himſelf, and reader*; which would make one ſuſpect he ſet about this work to atone for ſome fault (whether taking oaths out of the way, or what elſe, he beſt knows) and its plain he ſuppoſes any man that reads him does pennance, (how juſt is this!) *tho' not ſo great as it wou'd have been, had the book been greater.* Here he's merciful; and I hope I may put in for a ſhare of his kindneſs, and expect, ſince I have ſubmitted to the pennance of reading, and greater pennance of replying to ſo many dull paragraphs, that if ever I make him my confeſſor, he'll forgive me the fault of writing the *Memorial. But there's an infinite number of particulars that deſerve to be thrown into the number of errata,* if the *Memorial comes to another impreſſion.* But how is it poſſible at this rate it ſhould ever come to another impreſſion? Where in all the world will he direct me to a bookſeller, ſelf-denying enough to undertake the work upon ſuch terms? Firſt to print the book, and then to print an infinite number of errata! Would it not be much better (I ſpeak with ſubmiſſion) to deſtroy this bad book, and make another without errata, according to this gentleman's correction, than print a book that's infinitely falſe, and then print another infinite book to detect the falſehoods of the former? What he ſuppoſes as neceſſary to ſet all things right in another edition, is highly reaſonable, namely, that the author entirely forego all pretences to infallibility; he is out of his wits ſure, if he don't, when in one little book he has fallen into an infinite number of errata. He would have a table drawn up for this purpoſe. For what purpoſe? Any one that reads the paragraph would underſtand it, that it muſt be drawn up for diſclaiming pretences to infallibility; and nothing can

lead one to take it otherwiſe, but that its nonſenſe (which yet in our author's book is no reaſon at all). I do ſuppoſe, indeed, he refers to the remoter antecedent, and wou'd have a table drawn up, an huge table, to hold an infinite number of errata. But why then did he not ſpeak intelligibly? Nor is this the only, or the worſt inſtance of his obſcurity; he frequently covers himſelf with darkneſs, which I mention here only for this reaſon, to make a requeſt to him, that if he thinks himſelf called to inſtruct mankind with his learned writings, and reſolve ſtill to write *incognito*, he would be pleaſed to direct his reader to ſome ſufficient perſon whom he has appointed for his interpreter.

But I muſt apply myſelf more cloſely to the work this gentleman has cut out for me, and conſider his Performance; and as I do not find it's like to anſwer it ſelf, as the *Memorial* it ſeems doth, I'm willing to afford it ſuch help as I think neceſſary. The title-page ſeems to me a little peculiar; one can ſcarce imagine it to be ſet by ſo charitable and candid a man as he repreſents himſelf to be. *Presbyterian prejudice diſplay'd.* One wou'd be ready to ſurmiſe that the contriver of this aukward title, whether he was the *Wellwiſher*, or any elſe, *had* Scotch *presbyterian eloquence* before him; and therefore, as he found ſome of the flowers of *that* pamphlet in *this*, and the ſtile and ſpirit of the one, imitated by the other, he thought proper the titles ſhould a little chime. But whatever led him to it, it does not ſeem to me a *decent* title. It is not *juſt* to impute to a whole body, what belongs to a ſingle perſon; which yet is done by this title. If he is ſure the author of the *Memorial* is a presbyterian, and prejudiced, it does not follow, that all the presbyterians are ſo. Shou'd an angry adverſary have encountred Mr. *Wellwiſher*, who happened to think that often he does not write common ſenſe, wou'd it not have been injurious to call his reply *Epiſcopal nonſenſe diſplay'd?* For whatever may be the caſe of this gentleman, 'tis certain many others of the epiſcopal party both ſpeak and write good ſenſe:

nor

nor doth this gentleman himſelf think ſuch treatment equitable, when another ſort of perſons, much dearer to him, are concerned: witneſs what he ſays, *p.* 91. "admitting that the mob our author takes notice of, was a "tory mob, is it reaſonable or juſt to charge the whole body of tories with it, &c." So unhappily does he here, and in many other places, forget his own title.

Nor is it prudent thus to proclaim war againſt a whole body; 'tis a needleſs creating himſelf enemies; it tends to prejudice thoſe againſt his performance, at whoſe conviction and inſtruction he wou'd be ſuppoſed to aim in this charitable work: not to ſay that he has not acted over wiſely for himſelf, thus to arraign prejudice, and hang it up in chains, in the frontiſpiece of his book; for tho' it be in its ſelf bad enough, yet there are good reaſons why he, of all men, ſhou'd have ſpared it: one is, the great occaſion he has for it in his reader: for who in the world, without the help of prejudice, and a large ſtock of it too, can take his performance for an anſwer to the book he writes againſt: another is, the great uſe he himſelf has made of it: who can look into his pamphlet, and think of his title without applying to him that of the apoſtle *Rom.* 2. 1. *Thou art inexcuſable, O man, whoſoever thou art that judgeſt; for wherein thou judgeſt another, thou condemneſt thy ſelf; for thou that judgeſt doſt the ſame things.* He cryes out of prejudice, and yet how woſully tinctured with it himſelf? Is there no prejudice in it (to omit other flagrant inſtances) that the authors he produces on his ſide are ſo generally diſtinguiſhed with the epithets of *learned, orthodox, judicious, excellent, admirable divines, authentick hiſtorian,* &c. whilſt thoſe on the other ſide are ſtigmatiz'd as *partial, fanaticks, infamous bigots,* &c. I don't call this epiſcopal prejudice; for I am ſenſible there are a great number of learned men of that denomination, that ſcorn ſuch a mean diſhonourable way of writing: but 'tis a ſufficient argument of this gentlemans weakneſs and prejudice, and I wiſh it may teach him, for the future, better manners and diſcretion in the

choice of his titles, if he favour the world with more of his lucubrations.

I cou'd heartily join with the Author in bewailing the prejudices of mankind, which I reckon all are under the influence of, more or leſs: we imbibe them from our very infancy; from the ſeveral inſtruments of our Education, from our reading, company, converſe, &c. and tho' we often talk of *putting off all prejudices*, its but talk: we muſt firſt put off the body: ſome indeed get more above them than others, have minds open to conviction, prepared to receive truth as ſuch, to embrace and profeſs it under all diſcouragements, and to follow it wherever it carries them. But as this is a character the greateſt part of the world can lay no claim to, ſo thoſe few that can, 'tis only in part: the beſt have an allay of prejudice: it cleaves to us like the leproſie to the infected houſes under the law: a conſideration that ſhould diſpoſe us to pity the common infirmity of humane nature, and to treat one another with tenderneſs, mutual good nature, and forbearance, as thoſe that are conſcious of our own weakneſs; ſhould incline us to make favourable allowances where there's room for them; ſuppoſing we our ſelves may poſſibly be miſtaken, when we think our brethern are ſo; or at leaſt, that their miſtakes are involuntary, and what wiſe and good Men may fall into, in the ſincere purſuit of truth. This is the improvement we ſhould make of the ſenſe we have, or ought to have, of the prejudices we are all liable to; and not reproach others with what we our ſelves, it may be, are as guilty of as any in the world, the common caſe of peeviſh bigots, who make the loudeſt exclamations againſt prejudice, when at the ſame time their own prejudices invenom every leaf of paper they write. If I may be allowed by good Mr. *Wellwiſher* to ſpeak a word here for my ſelf, I can aſſure him, that tho' I do not pretend that I have no prejudice, or that prejudice had no hand in drawing up the Memorial, yet I have not, thro' wilful prejudice, miſrepreſented any fact in favour of

a cauſe, as he boldly accuſes in the beginning of his pamphlet, *p.* 1. But I leave this author to declaim againſt the prejudices of other people, as he ſees fit; tho' I can't but think it might be as much his concern to examine, a little more narrowly, into his own breaſt, and endeavour to diſcover the beam in his own eye.

His OR is not much better: Presbyterian prejudice diſplayed, OR, *an anſwer to Mr. Bennet's Memorial, &c.* an admirable way of anſwering a book, by paſſing over the greateſt part of it, without ſaying one word to it! above ninety eight parts in an hundred, as obſerved before, if the reader will be ſo kind as to look into the Memorial, and compare this pamphlet with it, he'll ſee how 'tis anſwered: he begins not till *p.* 60. and then goes through the book, *hop, ſtride and jump,* skipping over 10, 20, 30, 40, and ſometimes 50 pages at once, as occaſions required, and materials furniſhed him; and yet calls his paper an anſwer to the Memorial: nothing ſurely can warrant the folly and vanaity of his title, but the ſuppoſing that thereſt *anſwers it ſelf,* as he learnedly obſerves, *p.* 2. The truth of the matter ſeems to be this, Mr. *Well-wiſher* being diſpleaſed with the Memorial, reſolves to ſay ſome thing to it, and againſt it, and ſend it abroad into the world under the name of an anſwer; and therefore peruſing it with a critical eye, and with the diligence that became one full of his underſtanding, he lights upon ſeveral paſſages and ſentences up and down the book, and marks them for correction: theſe he ſtrips of all connection, taking no notice of what goes before, or comes after, nor of the occaſions upon which they are mentioned; and then conſulting the treaſury of his common place book, furniſhed and enrich'd by his learned and authentick authors, he falls upon them: and yet, even in this peculiar way of anſwering, the reader may obſerve he does not pretend, except now and then (how juſtly may be ſeen in due time) that I have no authorities for what I ſay, or that I have not truly quoted them: he generally allows the fact, only wants to paſs his cen-

ſure,

ſure: when he attempts to diſprove any thing, 'tis only by producing counter-authority; my authors repreſent matters ſo and ſo, but he finds others that give a different turn to them; and 'tis to be obſerved that the whole of his ſtrength lies in this one extraordinary circumſtance, that his Authors are *judicious, ingenious, worthy writers, authentick hiſtorians*, and mine are *prejudiced fanaticks, infamous bigots*, &c. and who can reſiſt ſuch evidence, or ſtand before ſo formidable an Antagoniſt?

He goes on with his title: *In which abundance of miſtaken hiſtorical facts are cleared up.* But how abundance? when he does not ſo much as pretend to charge miſtake in fact in abundance of inſtances; I queſtion whether twenty, thro' the whole book, are ſo much as cavill'd at: and all he has done to clear up, as he expreſſes it, any of theſe, is only alledging the ſay-ſo of one or other of his worthy and ingenious authors.

This great and good work, adorn'd with ſuch a title, has an author, as every one will conclude: all the account we have of him, is that he is an *hearty Wellwiſher to the eſtabliſhed church.* I don't think my ſelf concern'd to know who he is; or what he is. If I was, I ſhou'd except againſt this as no ſatisfactory account; 'tis not very certain what he means by the *eſtabliſh'd church*, that he wiſhes well to: the papiſts think their chruch the eſtabliſh'd church, as the nonjurors do theirs; the one eſteeming all the laws ſince the reformation, and the other ſince the revolution, null and void, as not being made by a competent authority: what church this worthy author has in his eye, and reſerves his good wiſhes for, I ſhall not take upon me to determine; but, methinks, it looks a little ſuſpicious to find him on all occaſions ſo warm an advocate for *paſſive obedience*: wherever he meets with this doctrine, he's tranſported with it, and riſes up againſt thoſe that oppoſe it, with a zeal that ſcarce ſtops ſhort of fanaticiſm. The indefeaſible right of kings, non-reſiſtance, &c. he tells us, was once baffled by a fatal ſucceſsful rebellion in 41. *p.* 11, and what opinion he has

has of thoſe that pretend to baffle and explode it, he intimates *p.* 12. calling them *knaves, fools and republicans:* can this be the language of a ſon of the church af *England,* according to its preſent eſtabliſhment, of a dutiful, affectionate ſon, an hearty *Wellwiſher*; when this very church has exploded the doctrine he endeavours to make ſacred, and leave upon the conſciences of men as ſuch. Mr. *Wellwiſher* wou'd do well to conſider how he can defend the church eſtabliſhed upon his principles, or reconcile his doctrine to the oaths he has taken, if he be a miniſter in it. Nor can I think it altogether without ſuſpicion, that he ſo often interprets of the church of *England,* what I ſay of the *Jacobites.* Thus when in the Memorial, *p.* 45. I take notice, *the party were inſolent to a ſtrange degree,* he tells us he ſuppoſes I mean (as in other places) the church of *England, p.* 85. and again when I mention the *Jacobites,* and call them a faction, he adds, *meaning I ſuppoſe the church of England, p.* 89. 'Tis moſt manifeſt (he and any other more ſimple reader may diſcern it) that I mean none but the *Jacobites* and *Nonjurors*; and yet he will needs have theſe to be the church of *England:* whether they are his church, the eſtabliſh'd church, he wiſhes well to, I ſhall not enquire, but ſhall leave him to direct his good wiſhes as he pleaſes, nor ſhall I envy any church the good ſervice they may produce, till he has learn'd to write with more judgment and temper: tho' 'tis evident, if he underſtand his own principles, and be true to them, they will carry him among the *Nonjurors:* if he really be of the eſtabliſh'd church, and mean honeſtly in the character he has aſſum'd in his title, he muſt explode his favourite doctrine of paſſive obedience, indefeaſible right, &c. ſo that whoever this worthy Author be, I think it certain he is either *nonjuror, perjuror,* or according to his own reaſoning and ſtile, a *knave, fool or republican.*

But diſmiſſing all further thoughts, about the author, who, or what he is, I now come to conſider his anſwer. After the blunder'd introduction, that has entertain'd

us

us already, he falls upon the *dedication:* and here he ſtands by himſelf above a page, before he calls in any ſecond to his aſſiſtance: and 'tis admirable to ſee how he can act his part alone: *he* (the author of the Memorial) *decks up the* hero *of his party in borrow'd laurels,* tho' he knows not whence one word was borrow'd: but having, 'tis probable, met with the expreſſion in ſome of his excellent writers, and thinking it a little ſprightly, he's reſolved to borrow it: but there is ſomething worſe than borrow'd laurels that he complains of; for it ſeems "on the "account of a pretended affection to the government "I am unconcerned how much ſoever this *hero* is diſaf- "fected to his maker." For the proof of which he ſubjoins a paſſage from the dedication *p.* 5. "that "I had ſaid the charge of *Arianiſm* advanced againſt "*L — d B* —— was not true, and if true, nothing to "the purpoſe." And here a fit of zeal takes the good man: he cries out in great earneſt, and is ready to ſtop his ears at the blaſphemy "is this the gentleman's "real opinion (ſays he) that a man is to be valued in "proportion to his affection to the civil government, "if his other principles be what he pleaſes? if ſo, an Hea- "then, Jew, Mahometan, upon a pretence of affection "to *King George,* are entitled to the ſame ſhare of re- "ſpect with the moſt deſerving Chriſtian, &c." I cannot but obſerve how jealous Mr. *Wellwiſher* is about *King George*'s honour; I do not ſay *for it*: I had ſaid nothing of my *hero*'s affection to *King George,* either *real* or *pretended,* and yet he draws the ſubject into the quarrel, and appears concerned, leaſt ſome people ſhou'd over do it here; and this is his manner on other occaſions: *King George,* and affection to his government, ſeldom come in the way, but he grows uneaſie and out of humour, and yet this very man glories in his loyalty, makes it the very characteriſtick of his religion, and that of his party, whom he repreſents, *p.* 40. as having an *awful religious regard to ſovereign princes*; as for the *diſſenters,* they are a party that carry no reſpect to crown'd heads

heads beyond the grave, if ſo far, as he inſinuates, *p.* 89. and yet in the preſent caſe theſe very men, deſtitute of all principles of loyalty, are loyal to exceſs: what can be the meaning of it? ſtrange, that an hearty *wellwiſher* to the eſtabliſh'd church ſhou'd thus grudge the reſpect and affection that's paid to the head of it; eſpecially when he runs to ſuch extravagant heights on other occaſions: but there's no great myſtery in it: 'tis very evident what ſort of ſovereign princes this gentleman, and others of his ſtamp pay their awful regards to: ſuch as humour and advance a perſecuting faction, that uſurp the name of the church, and are for trampling under foot all that will not bow down to them. When ſovereign princes purſue the duties of their office, protect all their good ſubjects, and reſtrain the ſons of pride and violence, then none more cool in their affection than theſe loyaliſts: but let Mr. *Wellwiſher* place his affection, pretended or real, as he pleaſes, he muſt not take upon him to direct other peoples affection, and I'm ſure he ought not to miſrepreſent it: how he'll acquit himſelf I know not, if I ask him for a proof of it, *that I am unconcern'd how much ſoever the L—d* B—— *is diſaffected to his maker.* I aſſure him I ſuppoſe that Lords affection to his maker, as well as his prince to be more than pretended, and that he truely fears God and honours his King; and having ſaid nothing that intimates a defect of the one, or exceſs of the other, nothing about his affection to King *George*, or diſaffection to his maker, this Gentleman, by accuſing only, ſhows he has no very awful regard of either; not of God, whoſe law he violates by calumny, nor of the King, when he envies him the honour of even a pretended affection.

The Author adds, that in the next page I bring a ſort of *ſalvo*, when I ſay, I think religion the chief ornament in every ſtation; but complains of inconſiſtency, "taking away from my patron with one hand, what I "had given him with the other." I had ſaid, *'Tis nothing to the purpoſe if he be an* Arian, *yet that religion is the chief ornament in every ſtation, and he that*

truly fears God, will not betray his country, page 5. and this he repreſents as inconſiſtent, giving and taking; tho' where the inconſiſtency, or ſenſe of his objection lies, I cannot underſtand: I had given the patron he refers to nothing with any hand, in the paſſage he mentions; and I dare ſay I have taken as little from him: but this is the fruit of dealing with a man that always talks in the clouds, and does not underſtand himſelf.

Having diſcover'd, as he imagines, an inconſiſtency, he thinks there's no way of reconciling it, but by ſuppoſing, that by religion I mean the *Arian* religion: the Gentleman I conclude has ſome meaning here, but ſo darkly expreſs d that 'tis hard to come at it. The argument that probably was in his head, tho' it never came out intelligibly, may be to this effect, that I ſay 'tis nothing to the purpoſe (viz. of the electors of Parliament men) tho' my *L—d B—* ſhou'd be an *Arian*; and yet after this acknowledge *that religion is the chief ornament of every ſtation*, for he that fears God, will not baſely betray his country; hence it follows that either I ſuppoſe that an *Arian* may fear God, and by the ornament of religion mean the *Arian* religion, or I contradict my ſelf in ſaying 'tis nothing to the purpoſe, whether my *L—d B——* be an *Arian* or not: this I conjecture is what the Gentleman would be at; and I have thus given the cavil its full ſtrength, and ſhall make ſome reply to it, not on his account only, but for the ſake of others: And (1) the reader will obſerve, that I expreſly deny the charge, that he is an *Arian*, and conſequently Mr. *Welhviſher*'s inſinuation " that I am not concerned how much ſoever he is " diſaffected to his maker. The ſtory of two hands, the one giving and the other taking away, is all an invention of his own, and therefore the inconſiſtency he talks of remains in the dark head that formed it, and yet (2) I own I have ſaid that if he was an *Arian* 'tis nothing to the purpoſe of his electors, and I gave what I apprehend a ſufficient reaſon for it, *becauſe we chuſe parliament men to be guardians of our civil liberty, and not to correct creeds*;

creeds; and he or any other more skillful diſputant, may try what they can make of it: this gentleman ſeems to allow my reaſon: True, ſays he, neither do we chuſe them to unmake creeds, *p.* 5. very good: they are neither to make them, as you allow, nor to unmake them, as you ſay; that is, they have nothing to do with the matter. Can it then be to our purpoſe to enquire into their qualifications for a work, we don't intruſt them with? The *anſwerer* proceeds hereupon to imploy his reaſoning faculty; *for*, ſays he, if once they fail to be guardians of our pure holy, unſpotted religion, we cannot reaſonably expect that our civil liberties will be long behind: but what FOR here ſignifies will puzle any man, leſs illuminated than our author, to tell. Having granted they have nothing to do with creeds, to make them, or unmake them; that is, we don't chuſe them for this purpoſe, but only to be guardians of our civil liberties, he adds, with all the might of a logician, FOR if they fail to be guardians of our religion, our civil liberties will not be long behind: this is ſtrong and bright: certainly never was poor FOR more abuſed. 3*dly*, Whereas this gentleman is confident I can never get clear of the contradiction, unleſs by religion, I mean *the Arian religion*, I do aſſure him I neither mean the *Arian* religion, nor the nonjurors religion, nor the whigs nor torys religion; but *the Chriſtian religion:* and do ſuppoſe that an *Arian* (tho' I reckon him miſtaken in his opinions) may have ſo much of the ornament of religion, ſo much fear of God, ſo much love to his country, that he will not baſely betray it: which is ſufficient to take off the charge of contradiction, grounded upon my ſaying, *if he was an Arian, it is nothing to the purpoſe.*

I had added, that you be a good chriſtian is of infinite conſequence to your ſelf: upon which Mr *Wellwiſher* makes a learned remark "and ſo it is (I will humbly for "once preſume) to every body elſe: for he that will be"tray the lord that bought him, and riſque his eternal "happineſs for the ſake of wordly advantage, will not "ſtick at the betraying any body elſe, &c." How charitable

ritable and wiſe this? of all the baſe motives that cou'd be imagin'd to carry a man into *Arianiſm*, worldly advantage ſurely is the moſt unlikely to have any influence: but what wonder, he makes the *Arian* a fool, when he deals ſo freely with himſelf, as in the preſent inſtance; when he preſumes it is of infinite conſequence to every body elſe, that a parliament man be a good chriſtian: this he ſays he humbly preſumes: but where's the wiſdom of the preſumption? a man's ſalvation depends upon his being a good chriſtian; and therefore, 'tis of infinite *i. e.* of everlaſting conſequence to him that he be ſo: but our ſalvation, I hope, don't depend upon the chriſtianity of our parliament men: how treacherous ſoever any of theſe may be, either towards the Lord that bought them, or in any other inſtance, 'tis not in their power to betray others in matters of infinite conſequence: beſides, does not this worthy man grant they have nothing to do with our faith, and that they are only guardians of our civil liberties, and if they don't betray us here, I deſire to know in what they can betray us, that we commit to them?

But it may be he only means in the midſt of this darkneſs, that an *Arian*, being a man of no conſcience may not ſafely be truſted with civil liberties; for having been unfaithful in matters of his God, and his own ſalvation, it cannot be expected he'll be faithful in the concerns of his country: if this be his ſecret meaning I would ask him and others of his ſpirit, whether they inſiſt upon real religion as a neceſſary qualification in a parliament man? would they refuſe their votes to a gentleman, that has a ſet of principles for their purpoſe (he knows what they are) till they are ſatisfied he has formed his creed aright, truly believes the bible, underſtands it in an orthodox ſenſe, and, which muſt be included, lives according to it? I dare appeal to them, and all the world about them, if this be their practice, and whether they are wont to reject a warm tory, that has zeal enough for the cauſe and them, meerly becauſe he appears to be defective, and ſtain'd in his moral and chriſtian character: if not, I would

further

further ask, does he think it worſe to miſtake ſome texts of the bible, of very difficult interpretation, than to disbelieve and diſregard the whole? is he ſure that an open debauchee has a better conſcience than an *Arian*, and that a man may not be as good a chriſtian, and as good a patriot, have as much fear of God, and as true regard for the intereſt of his country, tho' in an error in ſuch a doctrine, as he that ſwears, is drunk, or keeps a whore. But I leave him humbly to preſume as he pleaſes, and to enjoy the comfort of his generous principles; and only deſire he'll endeavour to clear his own head of inconſiſtencies, and then I am ſatisfied he'll find none in what I have here ſaid.

After he has tried his own skill, he ſeeks for help, and engages another againſt me, *a diſſenting brother*, as he tells me he is. Before he preſumed for once, and now he ventures for once; and what he ventures to do, is to range the two different characters (*i. e.*) the character the dedication has given of the *L*——*d* B———, and that of the diſſenting brother, in two oppoſite columns: and here all he produces in one column, *viz.* from the Memorial, is only the ſhort paſſage quoted before, that *the charge of Arianiſm is not true; and if true, is nothing to the purpoſe:* and this he calls a character of the perſon he's ſpeaking off, tho' it gives him no character at all: how kind had he been to his reader, if the reſt of the pages had been filled as the columns of theſe three pages are: it would have very much leſſened his pennance: the other columns indeed are well furniſhed from a pamphlet, called *Remarks on a paper entitled a letter to the proteſtant diſſenters, concerning the enſuing election:* all that concerns the dedication is in the laſt paragraph (in our authors eighth *p.*) the reſt I confeſs is excellently adapted to Mr. *Welhviſher*'s purpoſe, and could he have found a good ſtock of ſuch materials upon proper ſubjects, they would have enrich'd and adorned his pamphlet not a little: and I dare ſay my diſſenting brother, for ſo he ſtiles him, would have had the honour to have been often call'd upon, among others of our author's excellent, ingenious, incomparable writers.

But

But let us hear the remarks, "I own that one of your "miniſters in a dedication to *L—d B*——, firſt vouch- "eth that he is no *Arian*, and ſoon after ſays, he knows "nothing of his principles: but he further tells you, if "he was an *Arian*, 'tis nothing to the purpoſe; which "is ſuch an inſult upon the whole body, that if you "don't reſent it, the nation will think you ſure worſe "than prieſt-ridden". As the author of theſe remarks, like Mr. *Wellwiſher*, lets his arrows fly in darkneſs, conceal- ing himſelf, and does not direct his diſcourſe to me, I am the leſs concerned with him: only ſince this gentle- man has tranſcribed him, and adopted what he ſays for his own, at leaſt ſupports his charge with his authority, it may not be amiſs to talk with him a little upon this matter. The concluſion, *that if L—d B —— was an* Ari- an, *'tis nothing to the purpoſe*, I have ſaid enough to al- ready; and therefore I ſhall wait for the reſentment the author thinks due; I hope he does not mean by faggots, halberts, &c. and as for pamphlets, ſuch as that or this, I have very little dread of them: what preceeds I con- feſs comes cloſe, *viz.*, "that I vouch my *L—d B*— "to be no *Arian*, and then ſay ſoon after *I know nothing* "*of his principles*": this I grant is an inconſiſtency (and I can't but wonder, ſince Mr. *Wellwiſher* was ſo buſy in ſeeking out contradictions, he did not fix on this paſſage rather than trifle with another, nothing at all to the pur- poſe, and that he cou'd make nothing of.) I have but one thing to offer in defence of my ſelf, againſt the charge of inconſiſtency, and that is, that there is not one word of truth in what he alleges for the proof of it. For *1ſt.* There's no ſuch expreſſion in all the dedication as that, *I know nothing of his principles*, nor one ſyllable that im- ports it. (*2dly.*) I ſay poſitively that I heard his lordſhip declare, he was in his ſettled judgment againſt *Arianiſm*, and yet the remarks, as Mr. *Wellwiſher* quotes, makes me firſt vouch, that he is no *Arian*, and then ſay I know not what he is; whether an *Arian*, Jew, Mahometan, &c. 'Tis not eaſie to imagine what gave the occaſion to ſuch

a ſtrange miſrepreſentation, unleſs it was that I owned (*ded. p.* 11.) that I know no more of his Lordſhip's ſentiments, with reference to the controverſy (of *Arianiſm*) lately revived in the nation, than I intimated, (*viz.*) that I had heard him declare he was againſt it (*viz. Arianiſm*) and I hope that is knowing ſomething of his principles, and knowing ſufficient to warrant my vouching what I did vouch; eſpecially when I tell them the reaſon upon which I went in my teſtimony. 3*dly*, I am ſo far from intimating I know nothing of his principles, that I ſay a great deal of him, implying the contrary: I appeal to the readers eye ſight, and only deſire that he'll read true: thus *p.* 6. "I ſpeak not this from "an apprehenſion that your lordſhip has any opinions in "religion, that render you obnoxious, or that you need "be ſhy of owning upon proper occaſions: I have reaſon "to think you have examined religion, and formed your "creed with ſome care and diligence." And again, *p.* 8, "nor do I in the leaſt ſuſpect your lordſhip's religion, or "orthodoxy. I am perſwaded, ſhould religion be the teſt, "and the want of it a mark of excluſion from the parlia-"ment houſe, your lordſhip would be one of the laſt, "(pardon this indecency) that would loſe his ſeat there: "was I one of your electors, as I ſhould value you for "you excellent political principles, ſo I ſhould think "you not a little recommended by your religious ones." and *p.* 11. "that your lordſhip, who has ſo clear a view "of the chriſtian inſtitution, in the ſeveral beauties and "excellencies of it, as a doctrine every way worthy of its "glorious author, &c.' Is this the language of one that knows nothing of L—d *B*——s principles, and profeſſes to know nothing of them? I won't here apply *Pſ.* 120. 2, 3, 4, but think that petition in the Lord's prayer, *Matth.* 6, 12. ſuitable to my ſelf, and ſome others upon this occaſion.

But I have done with the remarks: would only ask Mr. *Wellwiſher*, with what modeſty he could tranſcribe ſuch a paſſage for the purpoſe as he does, and thus take up a falſe report:

port: the author of the remarks, he ſays, is a diſſenter *(i. e.)* in his ſtyle, a fanatick; and does he not intimate, that men of ſuch a character are not to be truſted? "I find, ſays "he, where a diſſenter is concerned, the bias is ſo ſtrong, "that we muſt inevitably be baulked, if we expect the "whole truth and nothing but the truth (*p.* 87.") He wont depend on a diſſenter, even where he has nothing to object againſt his veracity in particular; and yet here, when it will ſerve a mean turn, he follows one that he calls a diſſenter, in a notorious falſhood, and which he knows, or may know, to be ſuch: whoever the author of the remarks may be, whether a diſſenter or any other ſlanderer, Mr. *Wellwiſher* can't poſſibly juſtify himſelf, in repeating ſo barefaced a fiction after him. The remarker touched the dedication but by the bye, and it may be, was in too much haſte to read, and therefore depended on his memory; but this gentleman had the book lying before him, and was in the ſearch after an infinite number of errata, and conſequently could not be ignorant that the remarker's charge was mere calumny, and yet ſeems pleaſed with it, takes it up and propagates it. What can be ſaid for ſuch a conduct? I am afraid it is not very agreable to the many kind things he ſays of himſelf, particularly, "that he has not managed "unbecomingly, has kept within the bounds of chriſt-"ian charity, &c." Certainly, had Mr. *Wellwiſher* conſulted his own reputation, he would not have expoſed himſelf, as he often doth, by picking up idle quotations from peeviſh writers.

Our author leaving, as he tells us, the hiſtorian and his diſſenting brother, to diſpute the remaining part of the character, (how well he himſelf has bore his part in the diſpute, the reader has ſeen) he paſſes on to the conſideration of ſome particulars in the preface: and here he finds it written "that this undertaking was begun "without any deſign, for ſuch a volume; was to con-"ſiſt only of a few ſheets to introduce a ſermon "preached on King *George's* coronation day, connect-

" ing former with later deliverances." Well, what would one think a man could ſay to this, whoſe buſineſs was to anſwer the Memorial? what he ſays to it the reader ſhall hear; and I'll tranſcribe the paſſage, leaſt it ſuffer by an abridgment; " If the introduction to a ſermon was to " conſiſt of ſo many particulars, tho' contracted into a " much ſhorter compaſs than at preſent, the ſermon, " if it bore any proportion, muſt be of an uncommon " length, and the day, inſtead of a feſtival, was turned, " as formerly by the diſſenting brethren in *Scotland*, " (nay, as chriſtmas was by our ſaints here in *England*, " in the times of illumination, during the grand rebellion) " into a faſt; which was no ſmall affront to his majeſty, " to whom this gentleman and his party pretend ſo much " affection." I might here obſerve a noble ſpecimen of wit in Mr. *Wellwiſher*, that can, from ſo ſmall an occaſion, launch out into an admirable and profound diſcourſe: but it is the property of a great genius to turn his ſubject which way he has a mind, and ſay ſurpriſing things from the meaneſt text. Who would have expected Monſieur *Bail* could have brought in ſuch a variety of fine ſpeculations, and have diſcourſed *de quolibet ente*, when he was only to give a few occaſional thoughts upon a comet? tho' after all I find men of the moſt fruitful invention may forget themſelves, and talk impertinently; and ſo it happens in the preſent caſe. " If, ſaith he, the intro- " duction to a ſermon was to conſiſt of ſo many parti- " culars, &c." But did I ſay the introduction was to conſiſt of all the particulars of this book? he knows I did not, and therefore makes a ſupply out of his own head, on purpoſe to introduce an important remark, " that if the ſermon bore any proportion, it muſt be of an " uncommon length." He ſhould have told us how long; for every one has not skill enough to adjuſt the proportion between ſermons and introductions, according to the exact rules of decency; tho' it muſt be granted, if what he ſuppoſes be true, that the introduction included all the particulars of a book of between 5 and 600 pages, the ſermon muſt

exceed all reaſonable bounds. And what follows upon this? why the day is turned into a faſt, even King *George*'s coronation day, a day ſo dear to this good man, that he cannot bear to think the leaſt indecency ſhould be committed upon it! I dare ſay this gentleman, how tender ſoever he himſelf may be of king *George*'s honour, knows certain perſons in the world, who would have forgiven me, had I ſpent as much time in an harangue upon paſſive obedience, hereditary right, *&c.* even tho' the introduction and the ſermon happened to be a little diſproportioned; or if I had imployed the whole of it *in drinking healths to the alphabet*, (which ſome hearty welwiſhers underſtand the meaning of) or dancing to, *The king ſhall enjoy his own again:* but however I have blundered in this matter, and affronted King *George*, I am not ſo faulty as the diſſenting brethren in *Scotland*, who, as he tells us, did the ſame thing formerly, (*viz.*) they turned king *George*'s coronation day into a faſt, before it came: it ſeems by the help of their ſecond ſight, they ken'd the day before hand, and ſo rude and unmannerly were they, as to turn it into a faſt.

But he'll ſuppoſe for once, that the day might be uſed as a feſtival, and having made this conceſſion, he takes his advantage of it: "If, ſays he, it might be "comply'd with on ſuch an occaſion, 'tis a ſign our "author allows the legality of feſtivals on ſome occaſi-"ons; and if ſo, why may not thoſe of the churches in-"ſtitution be comply'd with? Was our Saviour's co-"ming into the world a leſs ſignal bleſſing, than king "*George*'s acceſſion to the throne? if not, why may not "chriſtmas day be obſerved by the diſſenters, not as a "faſt but as a feſtival, as well as the 5*th* of *November*, "or King *George*'s coronation?" and having intimated that both are equally impoſed, he concludes with a magiſterial air, "'tis nothing but a petulant humour "that prevents the obſervations of ſuch days." Who can deny but this man is, as was ſaid of *Peter Sterry*, by one of his admirers, *all pure intellect*? when he undertakes to prove

prove any thing, he ſcorns to fall below demonſtration: the ſubſtance of his argument in ſhort is this, that I preached a ſermon, an huge long ſermon, on king *George*'s coronation day, *ergo*; *ergo* what? not barely that I was impertinent, but its nothing but a petulant humour in the diſſenters, not to keep chriſtmas-day and other church holy-days: one would not, I confeſs, be forward to engage a man of Mr. *Welwiſher*'s ſtrength, and penetration, however, in the preſent caſe, I do not apprehend very much danger, and therefore I ſhall venture to obſerve a few things for moderating his reſentments, and in vindication of the diſſenters, againſt his charge of petulancy, *&c.* And (1.) it muſt be owned, they can and do obſerve theſe feſtivals this gentleman mentions, and have more reſpect for them, than he ſeems to have: they are hearty welwiſhers to the proteſtant church, and therefore can't but pay ſome reſpect to ſuch proteſtant holy-days, as I may call them; and they think a good account may be given of their practice herein: providence has diſtinguiſhed the 5*th* of *November*, by ſignal deliverances, both formerly, and of late, reſcuing the liberties and religion of *Britain* from the extremeſt dangers, and whatever this gentleman does, they think king *George*'s acceſſion challenges regard from them. When it pleaſed God to remove the laſt of the proteſtant family, then on the throne, they could not but look upon it a kind providence, that brought amongſt us a race of proteſtant princes, to guard and defend our proteſtant liberties, both civil and religious, which they have the greater ſenſe of, becauſe they ſaw themſelves, their country, and the whole proteſtant intereſt then on the brink of ruin: they are willing to take the opportunity, ſuch days give them, of reviewing and recounting the ſteps of divine providence towards the nation, in defeating its enemies; and the rather, when they obſerve the like deſigns and intreagues, that have ſo often threatned our deſtruction, are ſtill carried on: they think as the divine (the judicious divine) our au-

author quotes, *p.* 61. does, with reference to rebellion, treaſon and ſacrilege, that popery, ſlavery, and the principles which lead to them, are the ſame, and of the ſame ill tendency and nature as ever; and therefore apprehend it may be ſeaſonable on ſuch occaſions to expoſe them, and lay open the danger of them, whilſt they make their acknowledgments to the divine providence, which has ſo often appeared in their ſalvation. Nor (2.) does it follow, that the diſſenters think our Saviour's coming into the world, a leſs ſignal mercy, than King *George*'s acceſſion to the throne, as our author would inſinuate by his queſtion: if he'll join with them, in acknowledging the latter a mercy, a real mercy, he'll find them very ready to own the former a far greater mercy; and their practice, they preſume, implies as much: they obſerve 52 days every year, in commemoration of Chriſt, his incarnation, redemption, and the benefits they receive from him: had he appointed over and above theſe, an anniverſary feſtival for the ſame purpoſe, they would not neglect it. The church was thankful for the birth of Chriſt, in the time of the apoſtles and afterwards, when chriſtmas-day was not known in the world; and they hope, if gratitude for a mercy muſt be eſteemed in proportion to the days kept in memory of it, it will be allowed they give the preference to the birth of Chriſt. (3.) As to his WHY, *Why may not chriſtmas-day, and other feſtivals of the churches inſtitution, be obſerved?* and his wiſe concluſion, *that 'tis nothing but a petulant humour in the diſſenters that prevents it*; this only ſhews our author's admirable skill in reaſoning, and bewrays his petulancy. The diſſenters think there is a wide difference, between obſerving occaſional days for particular mercies, and owning an authority in any to appoint ſtated days of worſhip for the church; not only ſcripture precedents, but the light of nature directs to the former, calls to thankſgiving, publick thankſgiving, upon the receipt of publick ſignal mercies; divine providence doth, as it were, ring the bell on ſuch occaſions, and

ſummon

ſummon us into the courts of God: but it will not be eaſie to prove, from the obſerving theſe occaſional days, an obligation to obſerve all the feſtivals of the church: as the appointing the ſeveral parts of worſhip, ſo the appointing the ſtated days of worſhip for the church, we think belongs to the head of it: if men may interpoſe with their decrees and ſanctions here, we ask, who are they that may do ſo? by what authority do they act? and who gave them that authority? may it be reſtrained and limited by thoſe, over whom they pretend to exerciſe it? or is it an abſolute authority, which they may uſe arbitrarily, and extend according to their own humours? if ſo, this gentleman ought not to object againſt the Roman kalender, nor boggle at any of the red letters in it. As to chriſtmas-day, which our author invidiouſly draws into a compariſon with king *George*'s coronation day, the diſſenters don't neglect it, becauſe they think the birth of Chriſt not a mercy, or not a far greater mercy than king *George*'s acceſſion; but they have other feſtivals for the birth of Chriſt, and work of redemption, as the Lord's day, and the euchariſt, proper and ſufficient to anſwer all the occaſions of ſuch a thankſgiving: theſe Chriſt himſelf has appointed for that purpoſe: had he appointed the churches chriſtmas-day, they had been as ready to obſerve it, as any of their neighbours; but they find not the leaſt hint in the new teſtament concerning it; neither the apoſtles, nor the firſt chriſtians, their immediate ſucceſſors, kept any ſuch anniverſary; and, methinks, 'tis ſome prejudice againſt it, that we know not the day, when Chriſt was born, what day of the week, what month, nor certainly what year; which yet, I think would ſcarce have been hid from us, had the divine lawgiver deſign'd ſuch a day ſhould be yearly kept: in ſhort, whatever plauſible pretences there may be for this feſtival, 'tis of the ſame humane original with the reſt: 'tis of the churches inſtitution, as Mr. *Wellwiſher* intimates; and tho' that may carry a great deal of argument in it with him, 'tis of no weight

with

with others: if the church may inſtitute one feſtival, why not twenty, and an hundred? we know how far they have extended their power, and indeed, if we own it at all, it will not be eaſie to ſet bounds to it.

(4.) I think fit to remark, that the diſſenters according to their avowed principles, practiſe in this matter with latitude and charity; they don't cenſure ſuch as keep chriſtmas-day, and other ſuch like holy-days, but leave all to their liberty, agreeably to the rule of the apoſtle in this caſe, Rom. 14. 5. *One man eſteemeth one day above another, another eſteemeth every day alike, let a man be fully perſuaded in his own mind.* And indeed, the ſame temper they obſerve with reſpect to occaſional days, (the 5th of *Novembr*,) as well as the feſtivals of the church: ſome preach conſtantly on chriſtmas-day, and ſome conſtantly on the 5th of *November*, ſome ſeldom, and ſome not at all on either: for my own part I have often preached on both, as ſuitably to the occaſion, as I knew how; tho' never but once on King *George*'s coronation day, and that was, when I abuſed it by the diſorderly ſermon, and turned it into a faſt. (5.) I cannot but add, tho' I am ſorry I have occaſion for it, that whilſt this author, and others of his complection, pretend ſo great a zeal for days of their own deviſing, (that God never hallowed) they are cool and indifferent, even to a degree of ſcandal, about a feſtival of a divine apppointment: witneſs what he himſelf offers in defence of the book of ſports, *p.* 47. Nor (6.) is it very decent to make ſuch a ſtir, as he and others do, about their feſtivals and ſaints days, and yet ſo often reproach their brethren under the names of *ſaints*? ſtrange, that we ſhou'd keep anniverſaries in memory of the *ſaints*, and yet turn the very title into ridicule! Thus my worthy friend the wellwiſher, in the very paragraph under conſideration, complains of chriſtmas-day being turned into a faſt by our *ſaints* here in *England*, in the times of illumination; and again, *p.* 15. ſpeaking of the uſurpation by a fanatical vermin in 41, he ſays, " then a facti-

on

" on rode triumphant, and *the ſaints* of the presbyte-
" rian, or the independent tribe, continued in the ſad-
" dle." I can't tell what ſuch perſons mean by their conduct: if they have a mind to give hard names, and revile their neighbours, can't they call them hypocrites, fanaticks, or what elſe they pleaſe that is bad? but why *ſaints* in contempt? don't they pretend to be ſaints? and are not we all obliged to be ſo? don't they think it their duty to imitate the ſaints that have gone before them? why elſe do they keep days in honour of their memory? It would tempt one to think that baſe humour of the old Phariſees did not die with them (*viz.*) *to honour the dead ſaints, while they hated and perſecuted the living.* But I have ſtaid too long on this trifle; the great learning of our author has detained me, and muſt excuſe me to the reader.

The next paragraphs, *p.* 10, and 11, have nothing of objection in them, and what he quotes is only to make way for ſome curious ſtrokes of his own. I had ſaid, *the account of the reformation was at firſt larger*; but he thinks it too large, unleſs it had been drawn up with more accuracy, and leſs prejudice: a cenſure, that would really ſurprize any one from the author of ſuch a pamphlet, that knows little of mankind, and what influence bigottry in its perfection has to blind the eyes, and beſot the mind. He ſeems diſturbed, (*ibid.*) that I call the rebellion in the beginning of king *George*'s reign *horrid and infamous*; but ſomething muſt be indulged to his principles and ſpirit, which are too evident to be hid; though it is not, I think, excuſable, that he ſays *I paſs over in a more ſleight manner a more fatal rebellion* (meaning in king *Charles*'s time) *rather commending than condemning it.* I have inſiſted much more fully on the quarrels between the king and the parliament, than on the late rebellion; and for the concluſion of it, he knows what cenſure I have paſs'd upon it; and I leave him to ask himſelf, whether he has done juſtice, when he ſaith *I rather commended it.*

What

What he offers in defence of paſſive obedience, the indefeaſible right of kings, *&c.* I ſhall paſs over at preſent; this being a favourite doctrine with him, he often returns to it; and whereas he appears elſewhere ſomewhat more learned than at preſent, I ſhall chuſe to hear him when I meet him in his fuller ſtrength.

After he has complained, *p.* 12. that the author of the *Memorial* in his firſt chapter, runs too much into the principles commonly called *Bangorian*, (though that chapter was wrote before the *Bangorian* controverſy was broached) more exploded, he ſays, by the reaſonable part of mankind, than the doctrine of paſſive obedience by *fools*, *knaves*, or *republicans*; he comes to the book itſelf, and that he may perform what he undertakes in his title, *viz.* effectually anſwer the *Memorial*, he begins at the 66th page: and here he enters upon his office, *viz.* to clear up hiſtorical paſſages. The *Memorial* takes notice, that *it does not appear from our hiſtorians, that the morning and evening prayer were yet generally in* Engliſh. This he pronounces a miſtake, and he's ſure of it too. What I aſſert is, that this does *not appear from our hiſtorians*; and I ſtill ſay the ſame thing, that it does not appear to me, whatever it may to him or others; and I can't ſee this gentleman has done any thing to make it appear. He refers, indeed, to ſeveral authors in the margin, but they ſpeak not a word to his purpoſe. *Heylin*, in the place he quotes, only ſays, "That the people might be better acquainted with the "prayers of the church, a little before the king s going to "*Bolloign*, *anno* 1545, it was appointed, that the litany, "being put into the ſame form almoſt in which it now "ſtands, ſhould from henceforth be ſaid in the *Engliſh* "tongue; adding, ſo far this king had gone in order to "a reformation, that it was no hard matter for his ſon "to go thro' with it." By which he intimates, that ſo far only the reformation came in that reign. But does this make it appear, that the whole morning and evening prayer was in *Engliſh*? it is certain, *Heylin* ſays

no

no ſuch thing, unleſs the *litany* be the whole morning and evening prayer; nay, he plainly ſignifies quite the contrary, that *only* the litany, and not the whole ſervice, was in *Engliſh*, during this reign: nor is there any thing in *Strype*, or biſhop *Burnet*, that imports it. *Strype* ſpeaking of the occaſional prayers and ſuffrages, * ſays, "'Tis not ſo evident, that theſe prayers were "in the *Engliſh* tongue, but in the year following, "(*viz.*) 1544. there were, without controverſy, cer-"tain ſuffrages drawn up in our mother tongue, by "the archbiſhop's means, which he intended to be "univerſally obſerved every where;" but ſaith not a word, that the morning and evening prayer was ſo. || Biſhop *Burnet* tells us, "that *anno* 1544, the prayers "for the proceſſions and litany were tranſlated into the "*Engliſh* tongue:" he adds, "As theſe prayers were "now ſet out in *Engliſh*, ſo they (the reformers) doubt-"ed not but there being the ſame reaſons to put all "other offices in the *Engliſh* tongue, they would pre-"vail for that too:" but 'tis evident that yet they were not in the *Engliſh* tongue, and though they hoped they might prevail, it does not appear they ever did. "The next year, the biſhop *** ſays, *Cranmer* had *al-"moſt* prevailed with the king to make ſome farther ſteps "in the reformation, but that *Gardiner*, who was then "ambaſſador at the emperor's court, being advertis'd of "it, wrote to the king, that the emperor would cer-"tainly join with *France* againſt him, if he made any "farther innovations in religion." And as this diverted the king from it at that time, ſo he gives not the leaſt hint that the work before referred to was ever reſum'd, and again proſecuted in that reign. He obſerves afterwards, that one of the king's angry fits took him at the reformers, and gives an account of the perſecu-

---

* Memoirs of *Cranmer*, *p.* 128. || Hiſt. of reformation, *part* I. *p.* 331. ** *p.* 333.

tion and martyrdom of ſome of them, but has nothing of any farther progreſs in the reformation: ſo that I am not yet convinced, that the morning and evening prayers were at that time in *Engliſh*; though after all, whether they were or were not, is little to my purpoſe, nor of importance to any body that I know of: and yet the learned man ſets himſelf in great earneſt to confute the *Memorial* here, as if he had ſome eminent ſervice to do the publick: and how does he perform? why, ſays he, "this learned author moſt certainly la-"bours under a miſtake; for Mr. *Wheatly*, Dr. *Nichols*, "and others well vers'd in liturgical matters, tells us, "*&c.*" *Certainly*, and *moſt certainly:* hear his proof; *for Dr.* Nichols *and others* tells *us*. Admirable logic, to ſay nothing of the grammar. I muſt be miſtaken, for Dr. *Nichols* and others ſay ſo. But pray, Sir, what ſenſe has your FOR here? I may be miſtaken, but moſt certainly Dr. *Nichols* and others telling you ſo, is no argument I am miſtaken: and it deſerves a remark, that when this wiſe man has given this wiſe reaſon for proof of his certainty, that I am certainly miſtaken, he only produces the very ſame paſſage I my ſelf had cited out of Dr. *Nichols*, and which I ſuppoſed not warranted by hiſtorians: ſo that the whole amounts to juſt thus much; I am certainly miſtaken that the morning and evening prayer were in *Engliſh*, as Dr. *Nichols* had ſaid, for Dr. *Nichols* ſays it. In the margin, indeed, he points to other authorities, as *Heylin* and *Strype*, but miſrepreſents them: and in this manner does Mr. *Welwiſher* trifle all along, and yet calls ſuch ſtuff an *Anſwer to the Memorial.*

He goes on with his work, *to clear up hiſtorical paſſages. In the form of proceſſion*, (ſays the *Memorial*, p. 60.) *was à litany in which they invocated the Virgin, angels, archangels*, &c, and here he ſays I quote *Strype*, who mentions not a ſyllable of the invocation of angels, *&c.* and thereupon turns monitor. "With good reaſon, ſays he, "I may call upon our hiſtorian to retract this par-

ticular.

" ticular, which is no better than falſifying a matter " of fact," (that is, making a thing that is true falſe;) he means, I doubt not, *in a matter of fact:* but not too faſt, good Sir, look again, and you may eaſily be convinced that here is no falſifying at all, and that retracting ought to be your own work: the paſſage I quote *Strype* for is what goes before, as is plain from the mark of reference; what follows about invocating angels I don't refer to *Strype* for: is it not ſtrange that this gentleman, who pretends to clear up abundance of miſtaken hiſtorical facts, and complains of an infinite number of miſtakes, that he's ſo kind as to overlook, ſhould thus blunder and miſtake himſelf in thoſe he meddles with? ſurely, it muſt be a cavilling humour that ſet him a work. After he has charged me with quoting *Strype* falſely, when really I don't quote him at all, in the inſtance before us, he goes on to prove from that author, that there could be no ſuch invocation, as I have mentioned in the ſuffrages; to which purpoſe he quotes the king's primer, containing very ſharp and ſevere reflections upon popiſh devotions, and praying to ſaints; but what he means here, I confeſs I am not able to determine with certainty. What he ſaith, I am ſatisfy'd, concludes nothing againſt the invocation. *Strype* ſeems to ſuppoſe the ſuffrages, in which this form might be, different from the primer; for he owns he had not ſeen them, but I preſume had ſeen the primer. But ſuppoſing the ſuffrages and form of proceſſion to be contain'd in the king's primer, I can't ſee what *Strype* ſaith proves, there could be no ſuch invocation as I have mentioned, even in the form of that primer: it reflects, it's true, on popiſh devotion, and praying to ſaints; but theſe might be the popiſh doubtful ſaints, as is probable from Mr. *Strype*'s account of the matter: " In " this litany, ſaith he, all doubtful ſaints are left out, " and he addreſſeth only to the holy angels, St. *Michael*, " St. *Raphael*, *&c.* to pray for us, and the bleſſed " apoſtles, St. *Peter*, St. *Andrew*." So that what Mr.

Strype ſaith of the primer implies no ſuch thing as our author infers, but the contrary, that they did invocate ſaints and angels: certainly this gentleman ought to have furniſhed himſelf better for his undertaking before he engaged: 'tis, methinks, but an odd way of correcting hiſtorical miſtakes, firſt, to ſuppoſe what his eyes might have told him is falſe, and then go about to diſprove a piece of hiſtory by an authority, that ſays no thing againſt it.

His next adventure, *p.* 14. is more ſucceſsful: He finds I have quoted a wrong page of biſhop *Burnet*, and a wrong year of king *Henry* the eighth; in both which I ſubmit to his correction: but could he not have contented himſelf with this eminent diſplay of learning, without inſulting? "If, ſaith he, the infal-"libility of a presbyterian teacher will permit him to "take notice of errata, 'tis in *p.* 28." But ſure the presbyterian teachers do not pretend that, not only themſelves, but their tranſcribers and printers are infallible too. I believe there are fewer errata in the *Memorial*, than in this gentleman's pamphlet, and yet I find ſeveral beſides theſe two he corrects with ſo much modeſty. Whether it be their overſight or mine that has occaſion'd this miſtake in figures, I cannot ſay; however it fell out well for our author, as it gave him an opportunity of performing ſomething of what he promis'd; theſe being the only hiſtorical paſſages that he has cleared up: and I verily think, if he be always careful and attentive in ſuch matters, he will do far more ſervice to the publick, as a corrector of the preſs, than an author.

P. 15. He complains of the *Memorial* for ſaying *p.* 75. *That in reviſing the common prayer, and in the alteration of its offices, they did as much as they apprehended the ſtate of things would bear, retaining as much of the old ſervice as appeared to them tolerable, rejecting only the more palpable errors, and ſuperſtition of popery.* And here he cries out, "ſay you ſo, good Sir! and is this the reſult of "your moſt ſerious and deliberate thoughts? Do you

deſign

" deſign to caſt a ſlur upon the reformation by inſi-
" nuating, that theſe pious reformers rejected only the
" moſt palpable and ſuperſtitious errors of popery." I anſwer, it is the reſult of my deliberate thoughts, that they really did this in reforming the ſervice book; in which I have the concurrence of ſeveral eminent doctors of the church of *England*. *Heylin* ſays, " the
" learned among the papiſts conform'd to the new ſervice,
" and that it differed little from what it was before." To the ſame purpoſe Dr. *Fuller*, * " To reform all at
" once, ſays he, would have been the ready way to
" reform nothing at all; new wine muſt be gently
" pour'd into old bottles: our reformers began mode-
" rately, as the ſubject would give them leave." He adds,
" They permitted ignorant people ſtill to keep ſome of
" their fond and fooliſh cuſtoms, that they might re-
" move from them the moſt dangerous ſuperſtition." And in the like ſtrain ſpeaks biſhop *Burnet*: vid. *Memorial.* *p.* 98.

P. 16. *The articles were not drawn up in convocation but more probably compiled by* Cranmer *and* Ridley, Cranmer *not daring to truſt the convocation.*" " But biſhop
" *Burnet*, ſays the anſwerer, in the place our author re-
" fers to, mentions not one ſyllable of *Cranmer*'s diſ-
" truſting the convocation, which is an addition I pre-
" ſume of his own, with a deſign, no doubt, of pre-
" judicing his reader againſt convocations in general." What I ſay is this, (*p.* 81.) *Dr.* Burnet *ſhews, that the articles were not drawn up in convocation, but probably compiled by* Cranmer *and* Ridley, Cranmer *not daring, it ſeems, to truſt the convocation in this matter.*" Where 'tis plain, I don't pretend to quote the very words of *Burnet*, only to repreſent the account he gives of this affair; and I dare refer it to any man of common equity, that will read Dr. *Burnet*, whether I miſrepreſent him or not.

---

* Ch. Hiſt. lib. 7. *p.* 374, 375.

He tells us upon what conſiderations that work (*viz.* of framing articles) was delayeed till this year, (1551) in which they ſet about it, and finiſhed it, before the convocation met in the next *February*. He adds, " In what " method they proceeded in the compiling of theſe ar- " ticles, whether they were given out to ſeveral bi- " ſhops and divines to deliver their opinions about them, " as was done formerly, or not, is not certain : I have " found it often ſaid they were framed hy *Cranmer* and " *Ridley*, which I think more probable." It is evident the articles, according to Dr. *Burnet*, who expreſsly ſays it, were drawn up *before* the convocation met, and therefore could not be drawn up in convocation : what I add as the reaſon of this, that *Cranmer* durſt not truſt the convocation with that matter, where he expected great diverſity of opinions, is only a concluſion I make, from the biſhop's repreſentation of the ſtate of the clergy at that time ; and therefore I only ſay *it ſeems:* and indeed had not the archbiſhop ſuſpected, either the ability or inclinations of the clergy, I hardly think the articles had been drawn up and finiſhed before the convocation met. But whatever was *Cranmer*'s reaſon, I am perſuaded it was better than this gentleman can give, for his falſe charge of the *Memorial*, which quotes *Burnet* for nothing but what he ſaith.

P. 17. We have another ſpecimen of the great ſervice this gentleman has done as hiſtorical cenſor. The *Memorial* mentions the reforming the eccleſiaſtical courts and laws, (*p.* 82.) and ſays, *the work is publiſhed in* Sparrow. " This (cries the author) I dare almoſt pre- " ſume to affirm is a miſtake: for tho' it be publiſhed " by itſelf, it is in no edition of *Sparrow*'s collections " that ever I met with." But what is this to the purpoſe of anſwering the *Memorial*, or of what importance to any part of mankind? Surely among the infinite number of miſtakes he has left untouched in the *Memorial*, there may be ſome of greater conſequence than this, and which it would have been more

worth

worth his while to have rectified. He owns there is ſuch a book: he does not find fault wirh the account I have given of it: what is amiſs then? why, *it is not in an edition of* Sparrow *that he has ſeen:* what then? I may have ſeen what he has not: and was it to any purpoſe, I could aſſure him, 'tis in the edition of *Sparrow* that I have, printed the very ſame year (1661) and for the very ſame man (viz.) *I. Garthwait* with the reſt of the collection.

He next finds fault, *p.* 17. that I ſay *Queen* Elizabeth *came to the throne, very much ſet againſt the groſſer things of popery, and yet with a reſolution* of ſhewing all the favours ſhe could to papiſts, *Memorial p.* 85. " by " that he ſeems to inſinuate, ſaith Mr. *Wellwiſher,* that " that moſt excellent princeſs was in ſome reſpects en- " clined to popery; he had been kind had he inſtanc'd " in the particulars, wherein ſhe was ſo inclined." What I inſinuate is plain matter of fact, which none can queſtion, that have read any tolerable hiſtory of her reign: as for her reſolution of ſhewing favour to the papiſts, 'tis a known confeſſed thing: Dr. *Heylin* * tells us, that there was great care taken for expunging all ſuch paſſages in king *Edward*'s book, as might give any offence to the popiſh party, or be urged by them, in excuſe for their not coming to church: (our author himſelf quotes this, and asks, was it not acting a prudent part, if by ſuch ſmall conceſſions the papiſts might be gain'd over to the church?) the prayer in the litany in king *Edward* s book, *to be delivered from the tyranny, and all the deteſtable enormities of the biſhop of* Rome, was expunged, and ſeveral other alterations made in favour of the papiſts; as may be ſeen in the *Memorial, p.* 86, 87, 88, 89. inſomuch, that not only papiſts attended on publick worſhip, but the pope was ready to confirm the book by his authority: if it be ſaid, this was done purely with a deſign to draw the papiſts into the

---

* Hiſt. Refor. *p.* 283.

church,

church, and in compliance with them; I anſwer, that might be one reaſon of her conduct; yet 'tis very certain, ſhe retained an inclination to ſome things, which as wiſe men as our author, will think ſuperſtitious, and ſavouring of popery; I have given inſtances of this in the *Memorial*; as her refuſing to eat fleſh in *Lent* (being forbidden by the canons of the church) without a licence from the arch biſhop, which ſhe renewed every year of her life, and ſuch was her zeal for *Lent*, that *Strype* intimates ſhe ſeldom uſed to hear ſermons any time elſe; nay, that ſhe expreſſed her repentance, that ſhe proceeded ſo far in the reformation.

This author ſhows his good liking of the change queen *Elizabeth* made, (*p.* 17, 18.) particularly he thinks the form uſed in giving the bread and wine was altered for the better; in which he has the ſuffrage of Dr. *Bret*, who tells us, the laſt form *Take and eat this in remembrance Chriſt dyed for thee*, &c. was never ſeen in our liturgy, till our ſecond reformers brought it in: if he means by our liturgy, the liturgy of the reformed church of *England*, that was but a new thing; and neither of the forms could be long in it: but it is like he means by our liturgy ſomething elſe, and carries his claim of intereſt beyond the reformation; and it is well known there are ſeveral particulars in which Dr. *Bret* prefers the popiſh to the reformed liturgies: whether Mr. *Wellwiſher* agree with him in all or not, I cannot ſay; If he had conſidered how little I am concern'd to know his ſentiments on the ſubject, or how little his declaring them is to the purpoſe of anſwering the *Memorial*, he would not have troubled me, or his reader with ſuch impertinencies.

P. 18. *The Rubrick, at the end of the communion office, was expunged, wherein it was declared, that kneeling at the ſacrament was required for no other reaſon, than an humble and grateful acknowledgment of the benefits of Chriſt*, &c. Now attend Mr. *Wellwiſher*. " I will not ſay *poſitively*, " that this gentleman here labours under a miſtake, or " if he does, that he was not led into it by *Hammon*

Le

" *L'Eſtrange*, or Dr. *Nichols*; but I think I may *al-*
" *moſt venture* to affirm, from the enquiry I have made,
" that there are more books without the rubrick than
" with it." Here I have little to do but to bow to Mr. *Wellwiſher*, and acknowledge his modeſty and charity; 'tis the firſt inſtance of that nature I have met with in him; he won't ſay *poſitively* I labour under a miſtake, or if I do, that I was not led into it by others. I ought to be tender here, when I have to do with ſo much good nature; otherwiſe I really think he has as much reaſon to be poſitive in this, as in many other caſes, wherein he is very poſitive. But how comes he to imagine that *L'Eſtrange*, or Dr. *Nichols*, led me into this miſtake, as he almoſt ventures to affirm it is? when Dr. || *Heylin* in the place I refer'd to has the very ſame words and ſyllables I here mention. The learned enquiry he afterwards proceeds to make, (*viz.*) what books have, and what have not the rubrick, I have very little intereſt in. I know where to find the rubrick, I deſire to direct my ſelf by in this matter, (1 *Cor.* 11.) and leave him to ſearch for rubricks as he pleaſes.

P. 20. *Even in the articles of faith ſhe thought fit to ſtep a little out of the way, to oblige theſe gentlemen*: and then he gives us (ſays the anſwerer) the 20th article of king *Edward*'s book; and ſays, " In queen *Elizabeth*'s
" articles, ten years after (1562) a clauſe was added, *The*
" *church has power to decree rites and ceremonies, and au-*
" *thority in matters of faith.* Is this power, ſays the *Well-*
" *wiſher*, more than was eſſential to the catholick, and
" every particular church? A power to determine upon
" the circumſtances, neceſſary to the decent worſhip of
" God, and an authority, as guardians of the faith, to
" declare and enforce it by eccleſiaſtical cenſures; and
" that only as a competent, not as an infallible judge of
" controverſies; for want of which diſtinction our

|| Hiſt. Refor. *p.* 283.

" hiſtorian (as ſeveral others have done) confounds the " authority of the church, allowed by all chriſtians, " with that of its infallibility, deny'd by all but the pa- " piſts." Did I think fit to increaſe mine own pennance, or that of the reader, as the gentleman ſpeaks elſewhere, by drawing out the diſcourſe to a great length, I might find enough to ſay here; but I only ask the learned author. (1.) How is this anſwering the *Memorial*? what is this to the particular now before him? I only aſſerted matter of fact, that ſuch an alteration was made in the articles, and does he deny it? or can he pretend to deny it? (2.) Where do I confound the authority of the church, allowed by all chriſtians, with that of its infallibillity? I make no judgment of the church's authority, nor paſs any cenſure upon it. (3.) How can he ſay infallibility is denyed by all ſorts of chriſtians but the papiſts, when a little before, he had been telling his reader of the infallibility of a presbyterian teacher: either he muſt think, according to his way of arguing, that the presbyterians are papiſts, or no chriſtians. (4.) I might ask, how will he ſupport that diſtinction, he thinks ſo very neceſſary, between *a competent, and infallible judge of controverſies*, when he aſcribes to the *competent* judge, authority to declare the faith, and enforce it by eccleſiaſtical cenſures. I utterly deny any judges are competent for ſuch an office, unleſs they be infallible: indeed he waves the defence of his diſtinction, which is prudent enough; for as that is nothing to his preſent purpoſe, ſo I am afraid it requires a much ſtronger head than ſtands on every one's ſhoulders; he tells us, I grant, the point has been ſubſtantially prov'd by ſeveral learned members of his church, to whom, to ſave time, he refers in the margin: I think, on the other hand, that what they ſay, has been as ſubſtantially diſprov'd by others, both of his church and out of it. He'll excuſe me, if, *to ſave time alſo*, I refer him to what I my ſelf have wrote in a late piece upon this ſubject, (*Irenicum, p.* 9, 10, *&c.*) which when he has anſwer-

ed,

ed, I ſhall think it more worth while to conſider the diſtinction he lays ſo much ſtreſs upon.

I paſs over ſome of his following paragraphs, in which as he objects nothing to the facts in the *Memorial*, ſo I am perſuaded the reader will think he ſays nothing I am concerned to take notice of: *p.* 23d, he quotes the *Memorial*, as ſaying (94.) *the reformation was a good work; but far from being perfect:* and then adds, "but the parti-"culars of its imperfections he is ſo wiſe as to paſs o-"ver in ſilence." So again, when the *Memorial*, (*p.* 95, 96.) had repreſented the canons, *as no ſufficient model of church government and diſcipline, and the plan of their worſhip not ſuch, as the firſt compilers either deſired or deſign'd*, he exclaims, and inſinuates all I ſay is a groundleſs fiction; tho' I had given him ſeveral inſtances of defects in the reformation, and ſome of them from a learned biſhop of his own church, and had quoted the compilers of the common prayer book themſelves, as making an acknowledgement to that purpoſe.

It is an ingenious queſtion he asks, *p.* 23. "where or "whence I ſhould be glad to be inform'd had he his "account, (*viz.* that a report was carried about in "*Francfort*, that *Bullinger* ſhould ſay, that *Cranmer* had "drawn up a book of prayer, an hundred times more "perfect than that in being.") Don't I tell him where? (namely) from Mr. *Strype*, whom I quote in the very words and ſyllables he expreſſes himſelf in: and then he goes on to other queries, about the quality of my author (comparing the unknown author, Mr. *Strype*, and me together in point of authority) and at laſt, after his uſual manner to ſhame and expoſe himſelf, falls a reaſoning: the ſenſe of which (ſo far as I can penetrate into it, thro' the clouds) is, that archbiſhop *Cranmer*, when in priſon, complain'd of his perſecutors, that they wou'd not allow him the uſe of a common prayer book; *ergo*, it cannot be true, ſince he valued the common prayer book, and thought himſelf aggriev'd that he might not have the uſe of it, that ever he deſign'd to have improv'd that

book, or made a better. All that I ſay is this, *that the report carried about in* Francfort *among the* Engliſh *exiles, concerning* Cranmer, *as mentioned before, is not ſo improbable as Mr.* Strype *ſuppoſes it*, mentioning Mr. *Strype* for the very ſtory: hereupon the worthy man imagines I have either no author, or ſuch a one that would diſgrace what I ſay, and then proceeds to trifle, as before.

P. 24. The teſtimony given by the parliament concerning the liturgy, *that it was drawn up by the aid of the Holy Ghoſt*, "I find, ſays he, gives no ſmall offence; "but I ſhould be glad to know why he is ſo captious; "was there any thing aſſerted which was blaſphemous, "or inconſiſtent with the aſſiſtance of the Holy Ghoſt, "in ſuch pious undertakings? or wou'd he confine "the Spirit wholly to his own faction, to their extem- "porary effuſions, ſtuffed with nonſenſe, blaſphemy "and uncharitableneſs." I doubt Mr. *Wellwiſher* is a little captious here, and was ſomewhat heated; tho', I am perſuaded, under no afflatus from the ſpirit of meekneſs and love: he asks, was there any thing aſſerted *inconſiſtent* with the aſſiſtance of the Holy Ghoſt, in ſuch pious undertakings; which is a queſtion, as he words it, that can have no ſenſe in it, pertinent to his purpoſe, but ſuppoſing he means any thing more, than might be expected from the Holy Ghoſt in ſuch work, I had before told him my apprehenſions of that matter; I don't pretend to deny but theſe good men might have the common aſſiſtance of the Holy Ghoſt; but I cannot forbear thinking, that the expreſſions uſed upon this occaſion, and which I quote in the *Memorial*, are too ſtrong, and imply more than common aſſiſtance; and I'm miſtaken if the authors themſelves don't deſign they ſhou'd be ſo underſtood, what ever evaſions may be made uſe of at a pinch; Dr. *Nichols*, in his preface to the common prayer, puts the teſtimony of the parliament in the moſt diſtinguiſhing characters; and in his *apparatus* to the defence of the church of *England*, gives it in latin thus, *ſancti ſpiritus* afflatu inſpirati *& adjuti*, (viz.)

(viz.) that the compilers of the ſervice book were *inſpir'd and aſſiſted by the Holy Spirit*. Biſhop *Beveridge* aſcribes it to an *extraordinary aid* and aſſiſtance from God: and how much ſome others have extolled the work, and and intereſted the holy ſpirit in it, may be ſeen in the *Memorial*. Now I ſtill think this is carrying matters too far, and if there be any, of whatever faction, that aſcribe the like aſſiſtance of the Spirit to their extemporary effuſions, as I know none that do, they are certainly to blame; but that won't prove others are not ſo, when they fall into the like preſumption; I muſt confeſs I can't ſee the work, theſe good men had before 'em, was ſo difficult, as to require ſuch ſpecial *extraordinary* aſſiſtance: it was in a great meaſure prepared and done to their hands. A learned * biſhop of the church of *England*, tells us, "that the common prayer book in king "*Henry* the 8th's time, was very much the ſame as in "times of popery; and that they made ſuch inconſider-"able and ſlight alterations, that there was no need of "reprinting, either the miſſals, breviaries or other offices; "for a few raſures of thoſe collects, in which the pope was "pray'd for, of *Thomas Becket*'s office, and the offices "of other ſaints, whoſe days were by the king's injuncti-"ons no longer to be obſerved, with ſome other dele-"tions, made that the old book did ſtill ſerve." And I dare ſay, this gentleman won't deny, that the compilers of king *Edward*'s common prayer book, retain'd a good deal of what they found in king *Henry*'s book: ſo that their work was not much more than altering ſome paſſages, expunging others, *&c.* and tranſlating the whole; which the common prudence of a few wiſe and good men, with the common aſſiſtance of the Holy Ghoſt, might ſuffice for, without *extraordinary aid or inſpiration*.

The next paſſage (*p.* 24) which our author makes very merry with (I hope he'll be better humour'd, and

* *Burnet* Hiſt. Refor. *part* I. *p.* 294.

not

not ſo dull after this diverſion) concerning the conduct of our reformers (proceeding moderately as the ſubject would admit, *like careful mothers, who if they can get their children to part with their knives, will let them play with rattles*) is a quotation from a doctor of his own church (Dr. *Fuller*) which if our author had attended to, and the *Memorial* lead him within half a page of the words, he wou'd have ſpared his wit to a more proper occaſion, and not have expoſed his doctor as an old canting dotard, entertaining an holy ſiſterhood with trifling and childiſh talk: but how unhappy is this man! he never light upon a jeſt before, and now he has quite ſpoiled it!

P. 25. " The account he (the *Memorial*) gives of " the troubles of *Francfort*, where he blames Dr. *Cox* " for being the ſole occaſion of thoſe diſturbances, is ſo " far from being true, that 'tis in a great meaſure falſe." I have produced my authority, and he has offered nothing to diſprove the account I have given, (except he finds ſome others, that he pretends has given a different account) but his own aſſertion; which I confeſs in the form of it is very peculiar; " 'tis ſo far from being true, " ſays he, that 'tis in a great meaſure falſe." I thought it had been a maxim among logicians, that *veritas non recipit majus & minus:* ſurely every thing is either true or falſe: and if this be far from being true, tis not only in *a great* meaſure, but *utterly* falſe; it may be he means, and I'm forced often to gueſs at his meaning, not knowing his interpreter, that ſome part of it is true, but a great part of it falſe; but then he ſhould have told us what he allows, and how much he thinks fit to condemn; and have given reaſons, not why he inclined to believe his author, rather than mine, for the reſt, for that I underſtand well enough, but why his authors are to be believed, and they only.

In the next remark Mr. *Wellwiſher* out-does even himſelf in trifling; the *Memorial* having mentioned Mr. *Fox* the martyrologiſt, who being called to ſubſcribe, refuſed to ſubſcribe any thing but his new teſtament in

greek,

greek, he ſays, " this may poſſibly be true; but I find " afterwards from the ſame hiſtorian, that he very much " abated of his ſtiffneſs, and found reaſon to alter his " opinion; as appears from a latin letter he writ to a " right reverend prelate of the church, in his ſon's behalf, " who was unjuſtly expell'd *Magdalen College* in *Oxford*, " by that faction," The thing affirmed of Mr. *Fox* is, *that he refuſed to ſubſcribe*; this gentleman ſaith, he found reaſon to alter his opinion, and as proof of it cites a letter that has not one word about ſubſcribing, either for it or againſt it; nor gives the leaſt hint of the change of his opinion *in the affair of ſubſcribing*; only complains of his ſon's being expell'd the univerſity, thro' the too great ſeverity, as he apprehended, of the puritans. I would appeal to any man of ſober ſenſe whether this is like anſwering a book; and whether this gentleman, if he wou'd have purſued, what he pretends to, in the title page, ſhou'd not have gone another way to work; and either have proved, that Mr. *Fox* never refuſed to ſubſcribe, or that Dr. *Fuller* doth not ſay ſo: inſtead of that, he undertakes to prove a thing the *Memorial* had ſaid nothing about, and had nothing to do with (*viz.*) that Mr. *Fox* afterwards changed his opinion; tho' even now, when he goes thus out of his way, one wou'd think it was only to expoſe himſelf; he does not tell us he afterwards ſubſcribed, or declared in favour of ſubſcriptions; only being diſobliged on the account of his ſon, he writes a letter, with ſome angry reflections upon the *puritans*, therefore he changed his opinion, and therefore the *Memorial* is anſwered: well might it be call'd *Weſtminſter*, ſays the traveller, after a troubleſome night's lodging there, for I was almoſt eaten to death with fleas.

I queſtion not, I ſhall have the reader's leave to skip over two or three pages; only I can't but take notice, that when the *Memorial* had hinted at the buſineſs of ſubſcription to the common prayer, and the ordination of biſhops, prieſts, and deacons, as a great hardſhip upon

upon the non-conformiſts, this gentleman asks, *p.* 27, " where was the hardſhip of all this? did they ever " prove, or *attempt to prove*, that theſe were really con- " trary to the word of God." A queſtion that ſuppoſes the author rather to have been aſleep all his days, than converſant in ſuch controverſies, as he has thought fit to interpoſe in, and collecting from learned, authentic writers: what did the non-conformiſts never *ſo much as attempt* to prove the terms of conformity ſinful (to them) or that there was any thing in the book they were obliged to ſubſcribe, contrary to the word of God? this he either knows to be falſe, or knows nothing of the matter: beſides a great number of books of the latter nonconformiſts, ſeveral were written by the ancient *puritans*, all tending to prove, what this gentleman intimates *none ever attempted*; I could refer him to ſeveral, as, *A treatiſe of divine worſhip*, printed 1604; *Engliſh puritaniſm*, printed the ſame year; *Twelve arguments proving the ceremonies unlawful*, printed 1605, *&c.* what he ſays in the ſame place, " that it is apparent from the " beſt hiſtorians of thoſe times, that there was not ſo " much real ſcruple in the caſe (of the *puritans* refu- " ſing to ſubſcribe) as of a petulant obſtinate humour, " and a deſire of being thought by the vulgar, wiſer " and better than their ſuperiors" is too bold and aſſuming in Mr. *Wellwiſher*; a dangerous uſurping the throne of God, judging the hearts of all men, arreigning, and paſſing ſentence where things lye hid and conceal'd from his eye: how does he know their ſcruples were not real, but that they were *hypocrites*? were fines, goals, baniſhment, of ſo great account with them, as to tempt them to trifle with God, and diſſemble with man? he is alike modeſt again, *p.* 30: the *Memorial* ſpeaking of the *puritans* in king *James*'s reign, *ſays, that ſuch was the fury of thoſe times, that many of them, with their families, were forced to ſeek ſanctuary in the deſerts of America.* This gentleman having betrayed his ignorance, and called in queſtion a fact, that no body in the world

that knows any thing of *England* can doubt of, adds, "I "think, men of ſuch a monſtrous compoſition, conſiſting "of ſuch an heterogeneous mixture, *as not to comply with* "*the legal impoſitions of the church eſtabliſhed*, were fitter "to herd with the ſalvages of *America*, than the civi-"liz'd inhabitants of their own native kingdom." Excellent divinity for a proteſtant! what then would be due to the primitive chriſtians, and the reformers? was not paganiſm firſt, and then popery *legally eſtabliſhed*, and yet did they not refuſe to comply with it? is the author of ſuch a compoſition, that he could comply with any *eſtabliſhment* by law, whatever it be? if ſo, he has a worthy conſcience, and none need wonder, if he has taken the oaths to the government, notwithſtanding he eſpouſes principles, that with all honeſt men infer the ſubverſion of it. But after all, this gentleman's reproaches, poured out againſt the *puritans*, can be no diminution of their characters; his enmity to them is rather an argument of their excellency, and helps to prove, what ſome great men of the church of *England* have thought them, *the moſt valuable body of chriſtians in their age, and the glory of the reformation:* and methinks, when we hear ſuch calumnies as theſe utter'd, ſuch raſh ſentences againſt perſons of whom the world was not *worthy*, pronounced by men of the *Cretian* character, γάστερες ἄργαι, it may confirm our faith in a future judgment, when all hearts and principles ſhall be laid open, all ſlanders ſhall be wiped off, and every cauſe truly ſtated; all weighed in an equal ballance; the righteous ſhall ſee it and rejoice, and all iniquity ſhall ſtop her mouth!

P. 29. Having no occaſion here for his ſkill in hiſtory, he falls upon me with his logick, *the great engine, ſays the* Memor. (*p.* 126.) *made uſe of to batter down thoſe that ſtood in their way, was a body of* Canons *form'd in this years convocation:* and here having cavilled at the metaphors, and affirmed that I borrowed them from Sir *Benjamin Rudyard*'s ſpeech upon diſmounting the *cannons*, or from old *Calamy*, (it ſeems he envies me the *honour* of being

the author of a punn, which I'm very willing to quit, tho' I can aſſure him I borrowed from neither, nor from any body) he adds, " I ſhould be glad to know " for what reaſons you call the eſtabliſhments a party, " which had the uppermoſt; 'tis ſtrange, that nine parts " in ten, acting under a legal eſtabliſhment, while their " adverſaries had but a toleration for their errors, " ſhou'd be called a party: you may with as much pro- " priety, when the nation is divided into ten equal " parts, call any ſingle part the whole, as the church e- " ſtabliſh'd a party." And having given ſo killing a blow, he very decently, and in great tenderneſs to me, makes a retreat for fear, as he ſays, of heating me: was an high flying biggotted eccleſiaſtick to be dealt with as an ordinary man, and bound to the ſame rules of reaſoning with other people, I could offer ſomething here, in mine own defence; but as the matter ſtands, I know not but I muſt be forced to yield: the myſtery and ſtrength of his arguments, no doubt lies in the words, *A legal eſtabliſhment:* thoſe of the legal eſtabliſh- ment, ſo far as I can perceive, he takes to be the only chriſtians in the nation; and then I grant 'tis nonſenſe to call them a party; otherwiſe allowing the reſt of the nation, who profeſs religion under ſeveral denomina- tions, to be chriſtians, I don't ſee but it is very proper to call even the eſtabliſhed party a party: " no ſays he, " they are nine parts in ten, and you may as well divide " the nation into ten equal parts, and call any part the " whole, as the eſtabliſhed church a party, *i.e.* in plain words, 'tis as proper to call one ten, as nine, a part of ten. I might juſtly queſtion this gentleman's computati- on, and utterly deny that the party, if he'll forgive the uſe of that word, which had the main influences in forming the canons I referred to in king *James*'s time, were nine parts in ten of the nation; the clergy are but a ſmall part of the nation, and the convocation that for- med theſe canons, but a ſmall part of the clergy; and I preſume the part I ſpeak of that then had the aſcendant,

and

and were for carrying things to ſo woful an extremity, were ſtill leſs; at leaſt I hope ſo, for the honour of the church of *England:* they were only a few fiery zealots of this gentleman's ſtamp, that cared not how hard they bore upon the conſciences of other men, ſo they might contrive an eſtabliſhment after their own humour, and for their own advantage; but after all, ſuppoſing this gentleman's computation right, that they were nine parts in ten, he makes nothing of it to his purpoſe; only gives a new inſtance of what he has often proved before, that his talent lies in tranſcribing: for why may not nine parts in ten be called a part? they are either a part or the whole; I know not but his logick may allow them to be the whole, but with other people I am confident they muſt paſs for a part, though the greater part.

And in the ſame odd manner he exerts his reaſoning faculty again (*p.* 30,) ſo unhappy is it for a man to be ignorant of his own genius, and offer violence to nature. In the next reign, ſays the *Memorial* (*p.* 129,) matters remain much in the ſame poſture, only carryed higher when *Laud* came upon the ſtage; upon which he asks how can this be? "could they be much the ſame, "and yet very different at the ſame point of time?" What I ſaid might very well be, tho' this gentleman has given a turn to it, to make his queſtion have a little more appearance of common ſenſe; ſuppoſing he ſhould write another book as weak as this, but fuller of invectives, might I not ſay he is much the ſame man in the latter performance, as before, only more ſcurrilous: ſhould I affirm that he was exactly the ſame, and yet worſe, ſuch a queſtion as he here asks, would be leſs impertinent.

I ſhall not concern my ſelf with the form and manner of this gentleman's devotion; he may worſhip towards the eaſt, or any other point of the compaſs, as he pleaſes, and bow which way and how he pleaſes; but when he calls *bowing at the name of Jeſus* an *Apoſtolical* command,

(*p.* 32) underſtanding the * apoſtle literally, in ſpite of the context, he might conſider the papiſts have as plain a text in the letter of it, for tranſubſtantiation.

P. 33. he quotes the *Memorial* ſaying, *that the old puritans, who ſtood for a further reformation, and yet did not withdraw from the eſtabliſhed communion, would have been forced to have done it, upon their own principles, had they lived in our time.* This is very much to be queſtioned, " ſays our author, for the terms are as lawful now " as then:" but how doth it appear that the terms are as lawful now as then? he knows, or might know, they are not the ſame, and that many things are required of us that were not required of them: king *James*'s book of canons wou'd, no doubt, have caſt the body of queen *Elizabeth*'s puritans out of the church; and what does he think they would have ſaid to the act of uniformity, and to the *Oxford* oath, which obliged never to endeavour any alterations, in the government of the church? they were excuſed from ſeveral of our ſubſcriptions and oaths, and yet even then ſuch of them as kept in the church, complained of the impoſitions, and were uneaſy under them; and indeed continued in it chiefly upon the view, and in hope of a further reformation; and can this gentleman imagine, they would have given up their principle at once, and have taken an oath againſt all further reformation, which they would have underſtood to be the import of the *Oxford* oath? but what ever queſtion this gentleman may make about their conduct, had they been tryed, he ſeems to make too bold with truth, when he ſays, the terms of conformity are as lawful now as then; unleſs he means that, tho' more be required now than formerly, yet nothing is required but what is ſtill lawful, *i. e.* in his opinion; but I am confident he cannot prove, that in the opinion, and according to the principles of the puritans, nothing

* Phil. 2. 10.

is

is required now more exceptionable than what was required then: and ſo conſequently the terms of conformity are not (to them) as lawful now as then; and therefore the reaſon he gives for what he queſtions being falſe, his queſtioning muſt be unreaſonable.

Having anſwered the *Memorial* thus far, he does in great goodneſs and forbearance to his reader paſs over 50 pages: I would flatter my ſelf ſo much, as to hope all that is in his phraſe, *authentick*; at leaſt it is more current than the reſt; but here he conceives he finds ſome things amiſs, and falls a nibling, (*p.* 34) but is willing to reſerve himſelf for a more vigorous attcak in another place: therefore removes his ſtation eight pages further, (*Memorial* 194.) where the *Memorial* repreſents, *that when the Prince was ſollicited to change his religion, the danger of it was objected by the Prince and his miniſters:* upon which he makes an admirable comment: "The "gentleman, ſays he, ſeems here to *object* without a- "ny grounds or warrant, having quoted no author "for what he ſays; the common account, even from "our *moſt authentick hiſtorians*, is, that when he was "ſollicited to change his religion, his anſwer was, *that "he came thither (to Spain) for a wife, not for religion.*" But what does the man mean? I object nothing at all, only mention the prince and his miniſters, as objecting: ſtrange, that he ſhould pretend to anſwer books, and not underſtand the plaineſt ſentence, but like an *echo* be carried with a ſound without meaning; he had heard *objected* in the end of his quotation, and then repeats it and makes me the objector: 'tis well he is not under the diſcipline of ſome men of a certain uſeful ſtation in the kingdom: if he was, I am afraid they would hoiſt him up: but he ſays, I object without any ground, or reaſon; if he means without any authority, he is miſtaken: he may ſee ground and warrant for all I ſay and more, *Compl. Hiſt.* of *Eng. vol.* 2. *p.* 765. nor is the account he produces from *the moſt authentick hiſtorians* at all to his purpoſe; what I object, *i. e.* what I talk of

others

others objecting, is not inconſiſtent with their authentick ſtory; both may be true, for ought this gentleman knows, at leaſt has ſaid to the contrary.

" In the next page he (the *Mem.*) gives an account " of a ſmooth letter, wrote by the *pope* to bring him " (prince *Charles*) over to the romiſh religion, and of " an anſwer the prince returned; but the authority he " quotes is ſcarce ſufficient to engage the belief of any " one, who is not too highly prejudic'd againſt the me- " mory of the great and moſt glorious monarch:" nor indeed would any authority have been thought ſufficient to prove any thing, that is not according to this great critick's guſt; I quote an author that ſtands in the collections of a learned biſhop of his church, not a little skillful in the hiſtory of the nation, and recite part of the letter as I find it in that author; owning at the ſame time that *Ruſhworth* has publiſhed a copy, that varies from this in ſome expreſſions, and that ſome have queſtioned the genuineneſs of the letter it ſelf; but what does Mr. *Wellwiſher* ſay to the matter, and to confute the account I have given? he acknowledges, that the *Pope* wrote to the *Prince*, and that the prince returned an obliging anſwer; but will by no means ſuppoſe he returned the anſwer inſerted in the *Memorial*; all his proof againſt it is, " that it's doubted by every one, " that's in the leaſt converſant in the hiſtory of thoſe " times:" where no queſtion, he proceeds upon his uſual principle; that when ever an hiſtorian repreſents a matter of fact, contrary to what he's willing to believe, he's prejuduced and partial; ſo here, whoever happens not to doubt of this letter, he's not in the leaſt converſant in the hiſtory of thoſe times. I might ask him whether the author I took the letter from, in the compleat hiſtory, doubted of it, when he ſays expreſly the *letter was thus*; or whether he thinks he was not *in the leaſt* converſant in the hiſtory of thoſe times, when he himſelf wrote a large hiſtory of them, and which the compiler of the compleat hiſtory, to be ſure, thought one of the beſt,

beſt, or he had not taken it into his work: what he ſubjoins ſavours a little of ſophiſtry; he's willing to ſuppoſe the prince might write the letter (in which he calls the Pope *moſt holy father*) but at the ſame time ſays, it cannot reaſonably be allowed he did; by which he ſeems to intimate, that he never call'd him *holy father* in any letter; whereas *Ruſhworth*, and to ſpeak after himſelf, I humbly conceive for once, every body thar pretends to give any copy of this letter, allows that he calls him *moſt holy father*; and having made the ſuppoſition, he undertakes to defend the prince's conduct, and thinks he might, from his great affection to that princeſs, and the deſire of ſpeedily obtaining her, write in ſo hyperbolical a ſtrain: and here he diſplays his learning; puts me in mind of a diſtinction of holineſs, *as either abſolute and eſſential, or derivative and relative:* which of theſe will beſt ſuit the pope, according to this gentleman's divinity, he beſt knows; and having quoted ſome of the fathers as giving and receiving the title of *Holineſs*, or *moſt holy father*, he turns upon me with all the life of a muſcle, triumphs over my ignorance moſt unmercifully: "but why, ſaith he, do I ſpend time in the proof "of a thing from the fathers, when I am ſatisfied this "gentleman is not acquainted with them, nor values "their authority, on that very account." What a ſtrange perverſeneſs is there in ſome mens tempers; ſometimes no reaſon in the world will ſatisfy them, at other times they are ſatisfied without any reaſon at all: this author is ſatisfied that I am ignorant of the fathers and deſpiſe them; and yet I am ſatisfied he knows no more of that matter, than I do whether he can conjure or no, what his name is, or where he had his great learning. If I durſt pretend to any thing under the ferula of ſo great a maſter, and after ſuch a ſentence from him, I could tell him, that I know full as much of the fathers as he ſeems to do, if what he here ſaith may paſs for a ſpecimen of his skill; particularly I know, that the title *papa*, *ſanctiſſimus papa*, had a very low ſignification,

tion, as uſed among the fathers; compared with what it has when applied to the eccleſiaſtical monarch at *Rome*; with them it imported much the ſame thing, as if a country curate ſhould ſalute this gentleman in the ſtyle now common among us, of *reverend*, or out of regard to his ſuperior learning, *very reverend Sir*: and methinks, this author, if he was not ſo buſy with his quotations, but would now and then attend a little to the reaſon of things, might be convinced, that the title of *moſt holy father* is more exeptionable in the preſent inſtance, than in the former uſe of it, when 'tis given to the head of the antichriſtian apoſtacy, and appropriated to him; made a diſtinguiſhing character of that exorbitant power, and dominion the maſter at *Rome* has uſurped, and in the exerciſe of which he tyrannizes over the chriſtian world; but after all, I can't ſee what occaſion he had, as anſwering the *Memorial*, to bring this matter into a debate here. I made no remarks upon the prince's ſtile, nor quarrelled with the title he gave the *Pope*, only related the fact as I found it.

Before our author diſmiſſes this ſubject, he brings a very home charge againſt me, which I think my ſelf obliged to take notice of: the reader ſhall have it at large, and in his own words, "he (the *Memorialiſt*) ſays fur-
"ther, that the prince ſolemnly engaged to the *Pope*, to
"ſpare nothing in the world, neither eſtate, nor life,
"for a thing ſo pleaſing to God, as unity with *Rome*;
"but adds this gentleman, there is not one word in the
"letter capable of being wire-drawn, even by an in-
"nuendo proof, to the ſenſe of what is here aſſerted:
"ſo that it is plain, that none but a perſon, who cares
"not what he puts upon the world for hiſtory, provi-
"ded it may ſerve a turn, would have ſo confidently
"printed ſo notorious a falſhood as this is."

Hear the charge drawn up with the utmoſt aſſurance: when I read it, I conſidered what it was poſſible for me to ſay for my ſelf: and (1.) this readily occurr'd for my conſolation, that I was conſcious to my ſelf,

ſelf, I had not knowingly, and with deſign, miſrepreſented any one fact in the whole book: and therefore (2.) I concluded, if the author whom I quoted had no ſuch paſſage, nor any thing to the ſame effect, I had tranſcribed from him in ſome ſuch idle hours as thoſe, in which my anſwerer drew up his book (*p.* 2): but (3.) turning to this hiſtorian from whence I copied, and comparing him with the *Memorial*, I find an exact agreement in ſenſe and almoſt in words: I'll tranſcribe both, for the gentleman's conviction, at leaſt for the ſatisfaction of others: the reader muſt obſerve that I abridg'd the letter in the *Memorial*, and did not pretend to give the whole of it: whether I have perverted that part of it now under conſideration may be ſeen by what follows.

MEMORIAL,	LETTER,
I will employ my ſelf for the time to come, to have but one religion, and one faith, having reſolved with my ſelf to ſpare nothing I have in this world, neither eſtate, nor life, for a thing ſo pleaſing to God, *&c.*	I will employ my ſelf for the time to come to have but one religion, and one faith, ſeeing we all believe in one Jeſus Chriſt; having reſolved in my ſelf to ſpare nothing that I may have in the world, and to ſuffer all manner of diſcommodities, even to the hazarding of my eſtate and life, for a thing ſo pleaſing unto God, *&c.*

Now let me ask Mr. *Wellwiſher*, or rather let him ask himſelf, with what juſtice or modeſty he could ſay, there is not one word in the whole * letter capable of being

* As the copy of the letter I have followed has the very words I have cited, ſo the copy in *Ruſhworth* has expreſſions of the ſame import. If this gentleman means ſome other different copy, he's guilty of groſs prevarication, and his accuſation is without modeſty or ſenſe.

wire-drawn to the ſenſe of what is here aſſerted; and what ground for his accuſation, that I have confidently printed a notorious falſhood: but I leave him to ſuch reflections as he may think due on this occaſion, and the reader to obſerve, whether our author has not diſplay'd ſomething beſides *Presbyterian prejudice* in his pamphlet.

P. 37, he again quotes the *Memorial*, tho' not in its own words, which are *p.* 206, *nor did he* (*king* James) *only connive at the papiſts from reaſons of ſtate, but ſome have ſuſpected his indifferency in matters of religion, and that he really had no great averſion to his mother's faith* (*popery*) *had it been his intereſt to have profeſt it.* In confirmation of this, " he ſays, I make mention of an idle ſtory of " Monſ. *D'Ageant*, of a conference between the " king and the archbiſhop of *Embrun*, in which the " king expreſt the affection he bore to the *Romiſh* reli- " on;" and in confutation of this idle ſtory, as he calls it, he has ſeveral things very remarkable to offer; as (1.) " If I would declare my real ſentiments, 'tis his " opinion, I don't believe one ſyllable of it my ſelf": but if I may be allow'd to ſpeak for my ſelf in the caſe, I do aſſure him that I do believe it, as much as I believe in any other thing related in common hiſtory, and much more than I do ſeveral things he aſſerts upon the teſtimony of his *authentick hiſtorians*; nor do I ſee any thing in it inconſiſtent with king *James's* character and conduct; what this author alleges againſt the ſtory, and to prove king *James* could not be inclinable to popery, and which he thinks will convince me of it, is too weak for his purpoſe: I am ſure it contributes nothing to my conviction: all the force of it depends upon a ſuppoſition, that king *James* was always the ſame in his profeſſion of religion, and ſentiments with reference to popery; or that he never diſſembled, ſpake one thing and meant another, one thing at one time, and a different thing at another time: a ſuppoſition which I am perſuaded, this author will have a hard task of it to make good. What opinion his admired friend Mr. *Eachard* had

had of him may be ſeen in his hiſtory, *p.* 407, "he (king "*James*) gave very unhappy ſuſpicions to the nation, "by making ſuch advances to the pope and papiſts, "upon account of the *Spaniſh* and *French* treaties: he "adds, notwithſtanding his open indulgences, and per-"haps ſecret inclinations to the *Roman* Catholicks, yet "in many publick ſpeeches he declared againſt them; "and once in a very remarkable manner; for, having "been charged with having a deſign for granting a "toleration to papiſts, he made a ſolemn proteſtation, "that he would ſpend the laſt drop of his blood, before "he would do it; and prayed, that before any of his "iſſue ſhould maintain any other religion than his own, "that God would take them out of the world. How "far this imprecation, ſaith Mr. *Eachard*, reached or af-"fected himſelf, or any of his family afterwards, we "leave to the determination of an omniſcient being." 'Tis plain Mr. *Eachard*, who is ſeldom or never mentioned by the *Wellwiſher*, without ſome high encomium, as learned, revd. *authentick hiſtorian*, thought king *James* might upon occaſion ſpeak warmly enough againſt popery, and yet *ſecretly* favour it: I can't but obſerve, that this worthy man quotes Mr. *Eachard* for the proteſtation the king here made againſt popery, as an argument of the king's abhorrence of it, when at the ſame time he knew Mr. *Eachard* mentions it for another and contrary purpoſe, and intimates his ſuſpicion of the king's ſincerity; but however this be, I have further cauſe to renew my complaint of our author's management; what I ſay is, that king *James* was *ſuſpected in matters of religion*, and relate from Mr. *Eachard* the ſtory of the archbiſhop of *Embrun*; but I do not affirm any thing poſitively; nay when I have given the particulars of the ſtory, I add, *whether king* James *ſpoke all this or not, or if he ſpoke it, whether it was only a copy of his countenance, pretended purely to ſerve a preſent turn, is what I ſhall not preſume to determine.* This gentleman, inſtead of ſaying any thing directly to the point, by

informing the world that he was not ſuſpected of popery, only attempts to prove the ſuſpicion was groundleſs, which is nothing to the matter in hand: and how doth he undertake to prove this? the reader ſhall hear, " To " ſhew, ſaith he, how far that prince was inclinable to " popery, ſome few paſſages out of his own work may, " I think, be ſufficient to convince *even our author him-* " *ſelf*;" which implies, either that I have never met with theſe paſſages before, nor any like them, tho' I my ſelf relate ſeveral, full as ſtrong, in the *Memorial*; or that they muſt have ſome very ſtrange efficacy, as produced by him; or that I knew nothing of king *James*'s manner, and that I thought his own words ſufficient to bear down the contrary evidence of a train of facts.

(2) As he thinks I don't believe the ſtory (of the archbiſhop of *Embrun*) ſo he's perſuaded Mr. *Eachard* don't believe it, who he ſaith relates it in ſuch a manner, as may eaſily convince his readers that he doubts the credibility of it; adding, " tho' I think there are but ve- " ry few things in *that moſt excellent hiſtory*, which de- " ſerve to be expung'd, yet, *if any*, this ſtory moſt " certainly does." How well our author is qualified to form *indices expurgatorii*, and correct hiſtories, may be judged by the ſpecimen he has given us in this work: but pray how does it appear, from *the manner in which he relates it*, that Mr. *Eachard* doubts of the ſtory? there is nothing in his introduction to it, which intimates his ſuſpicion of its credibility: " While, ſaith he, one " negotiation was carried on at *Rome*, (*viz.* with refer- " ence to the *French* match) another more ſecret was " managing in *England*, by the archbiſhop of *Embrun*, " who was ſent over by the *French* king, in favour of " the *Roman* catholicks in *England*, and likewiſe to " ſound king *James* about his thoughts of the *Romiſh* " religion; of which remarkable tranſaction we have " this following account from the archbiſhop himſelf." What is there in this ſo plain, as to convince the reader, Mr. *Eachard* did not believe the ſtory? nor doth the

concluſion

concluſion imply any thing ſufficient to convince any reader, except ſuch an one as our author, who has a rare faculty of believing what he has a mind. "Thus far, ſaith he, "the two *French* authors, Monſ. *D'Ageant* and "*William D'hugues*, archbiſhop of *Embrun*; of whom "we can ſay no more, than that the credit of their nar- "rative muſt be left to all nice and impartial readers "of this reign." And is this talking like a man that doubts of the credibility of his ſtory? at leaſt, is it plain that he relates it in ſuch a manner as may convince every reader of his doubts, when he has not in one ſingle word intimated his doubts? I doubt, I confeſs, if our author proceed at this rate to clear up hiſtorical miſtakes, no body will depend much on his credibility, that hath remark'd his conduct in the preſent ſervice.

I obſerved, Mr. *Welwiſher* is for having the ſtory about the archbiſhop of *Embrun* expunged, and thinks no paſſage in that moſt excellent hiſtory ſo well deſerves it; but I hardly think Mr. *Eachard* can pay ſo much deference to our cenſor's judgment, as to correct his book according to it; ſhould he hearken to this monitor, others might be encouraged to obtrude their advice upon him, and find him work enough by their troubleſome importunity. Perhaps ſome might point him to another paſſage, and inſiſt to have that expunged; I mean the ſtory about *Oliver Cromwell*'s contract with the devil: I am ſure, according to Mr. *Welwiſher*'s rule of criticiſm, this ſtory ought to be expunged much rather than the other; for tho' I cannot ſay of him, as he does of me in the ſtory of *Embrun*, that I am perſuaded he does not believe it himſelf; (for I find he has a moſt obſequious faith, he can believe any thing on the ſide he eſpouſes againſt the contrary party) yet 'tis very plain, to uſe our author's words, *that Mr.* Eachard *relates this ſtory in ſuch a manner, as may eaſily convince his reader, that he doubts the credibility of it.* The reader will excuſe me, ſince we are not about very important matters, If I give him the ſtory for his diverſion:

diverſion: ſpeaking of the battle of *Worceſter*, he *ſaith, " *Cromwell* in his letter to the parliament, tells them, " that the dimenſions of this mercy were above his " thoughts, and immediately after intimates, *It was a* " *crowning mercy*; but others, ſaith he, accounted it an " infernal judgment; concerning which we have a " ſtrange ſtory, in the laſt part of the hiſtory of inde- " pendency, which the author ſays he received from a " perſon of quality; (*viz.*) that it was believed, and that " not without ſome good cauſe, that *Cromwel*, the ſame " morning that he defeated the king's army at *Worceſ-* " *ter*, had conference perſonally with the devil, with " whom he made a contract, that to have his will then, " and in all things elſe for ſeven years, from that day, " he ſhould at the expiration of the ſaid years have him " at his command, to do what he pleaſed with both ſoul " and body. This is alſo related in other printed books; " but we have received a more full account, never yet " publiſhed, which is here inſerted; it is a relation or nar- " rative of a valiant officer, called *Lindſey*, an intimate " friend of *Cromwel*'s, the firſt captain of his regiment, " and therefore commonly called Colonel *Lindſey*, which " is to this effect: On the 3d of *September* in the morn- " ing *Cromwell* took the officer to a wood ſide, not " far from the army, and bid him alight and follow " him into that wood, and to take particular notice of " what he ſaw, and heard: after they had both alight- " ed and ſecured their horſes, and walked ſome way " into the wood, *Lindſey* began to turn pale, and to " be ſeized with horror from ſome unknown cauſe; " upon which *Cromwell* asked him how he did, or " how he felt himſelf; he anſwered that he was in " ſuch a trembling, and conſternation, that he never felt " the like, in all the conflicts and battles he had been " engag'd in; but whether it proceeded from the gloomi-

* *Eachard*, Hiſt. of *Eng. p.* 691.

" neſs

" neſs of the place, or the temperament of the body " he knew not. How now, ſaid *Cromwell*, what trou- " bled with vapours? come forwards man! they had " not gone above twenty yards, before *Lindſey* on a ſud- " den ſtood ſtill and cryed out, by all that was good " he was ſeized with ſuch an unaccountable terror and " aſtoniſhment, that it was impoſſible for him to ſtir one " ſtep further, upon which *Cromwell* called him faint- " hearted fool, and bid him ſtand there and obſerve, or be " witneſs; and then advancing ſome diſtance from him, " he met with a grave elderly man, with a roll of parch- " ment in his hand, who delivered it to *Cromwell*, who " eagerly peruſed it; *Lindſey* a little recovered from his " fear, heard ſeveral loud words between them; parti- " cularly *Cromwell* ſaid, *This is but for ſeven years; I was* " *to have had it for one and twenty; and it muſt and* " *ſhall be ſo.* The other told him poſitively, it could not " be for above ſeven; upon which *Cromwell* cryed with " great fierceneſs, it ſhould however be for fourteen " years; but the other preremptorily declared, it could " not be for any longer time; and if he would not take it ſo, " there were others who would accept of it: upon which " *Cromwell* at laſt took the parchment, and returning " to *Lindſey* with great joy in his countenance, he cry- " ed, Now, *Lindſey*, the battle is our own, I long to be " engaged. Returning out of the wood, they rode to " the army; *Cromwell* with reſolution to engage as ſoon " as poſſible; and the other with a deſign of leaving " the army as ſoon. After the firſt charge *Lindſey* deſerted " his poſt, and rode away with all poſſible ſpeed, night " and day, till he came into the county of *Norfolk*, " to the houſe of an intimate friend, one Mr. *Thorow-* " *good*, miniſter of the pariſh of *Grimeſtone*. *Cromwell*, " as ſoon as he miſſed him, ſent all ways after him, " with a promiſe of a great reward to any, that ſhould " bring him alive, or dead. Thus far for the narrative " of *Lindſey* himſelf; but ſomething further is to be " remembred, to compleat, and confirm the ſtory.

" When

" When Mr. *Thorowgood* ſaw Mr. *Lindſey* come into " his yard, his horſe and himſelf juſt tired, in a ſort of " amaze, ſaid to him, How now colonel, we hear there " is like to be a battle ſhortly: what! fled you from " your colours! A battle ſaid the other: yes, there has " been a battle, and I am ſure the king is beaten; but " if ever I ſtrike a ſtroke for *Cromwell* again, may I " periſh eternally; for I am ſure he has made a league " with the devil, and the devil will have him in due " time: then deſiring his protection from *Cromwell*'s " inquiſitors, he went in, and related to him the whole " ſtory, and all the circumſtances, concluding with " theſe remarkable words: that *Cromwell* would cer- " tainly die that day ſeven years the battle was fought. " The ſtrangeneſs of the relation cauſed Mr. *Thorowgood* " to order his ſon *John*, then about twelve years of " age, to write it at full length in his common-place- " book, and to take it from Mr. *Lindſey*'s own mouth; " this common-place-book, and likewiſe the ſame ſtory " written in other books, I am aſſured, is ſtill preſer- " ved in the family of the *Thorowgoods*."

Was it my buſineſs to examine into the credibility of this ſtory, enough might be ſaid to ſhew it ridiculous: ſuppoſe *Oliver* to have had ſuch an opinion of the devil's power, as to think it the beſt way to preferment and ſucceſs, to make him his friend and ally, 'tis ſtrange that he ſhould deſire a witneſs of ſuch a tranſaction: this goodly ſtory tells us, that he bid *Lindſey* follow him into the wood, *and take particular notice of what he ſaw, and heard:* and afterwards, when *Lindſey*'s courage began to fail him, *Cromwell* called him faint-hearted fool, and bid him ſtand there and *be witneſs:* I can't imagine why *Cromwell* ſhould deſire to have a witneſs, unleſs it was, that in caſe the devil fail'd him, and did not make good his bargain, he deſign'd to bring an action againſt him, and ſo thought fit to have an evidence of what paſſed; otherwiſe the man muſt be out of his wits, thus to ſell his ſoul, for the ſake of a little reputation, honour, and

ſucceſs

ſucceſs in the world, and then to take a method to undermine and ruin it all, as he effectually did by carrying a witneſs with him, to expoſe his villany: and is it not unaccountable, conſidering how obnoxious *Cromwell* had rendered himſelf to the nation, that ſuch a ſtory as this ſhould be ſo much concealed? I don't know the family of the *Thorowgoods*, and how far they anſwer their name; but to me it ſeems very ſtrange, that neither they, nor the enraged colonel ſhould publiſh the pretended horrid fact, which tended ſo much to diſgrace a man they muſt abhor, if they knew any thing of this ſtory: there is one circumſtance indeed, which probably may have weight enough to make all paſs current with Mr. *Wellwiſher*, and ſuch like perſons, and that is, *Cromwell* died on the third of *September* juſt ſeven years after: but that only ſuppoſes, that if the ſtory be framed, it was after *Cromwell*'s death, and that the author was not downright a fool: but I have done with this idle tale, and ſhall only ſay, I am ſorry Mr. *Eachard*, who ſet out ſo well, and has ſo many good qualifications as an hiſtorian, ſhould not only diſgrace his work with ſo mean a fiction, but in the latter part of it quite forget the laws of hiſtory, as he has done, and turn a party-writer: there are too many inſtances of this; and I muſt own I take it to be no ſmall proof of it, that he has render'd himſelf ſo exceeding agreeable to this author.

But what I am further concerned to take notice of is, that the hiſtorian, as remarked before, tells the ſtory in ſuch a manner as intimates he himſelf doth not believe it; and conſequently, our author being judge, it deſerves to be expunged: "How far, ſaith he, *Lindſey* is "to be believed, and how far the ſtory is to be account-"ed incredible, is left to the reader's faith and judg-"ment, and not to any determination of our own:" and at the beginning, "this account is here inſerted "*as a thing more wonderful than probable, and therefore* "*more for the diverſion than ſatisfaction of the readers.*

Now I leave the reader to judge what opinion Mr. *Eachard* had of this ſtory, and whether our good friend the anſwerer ought not to be eſteemed a perſon of uncommon impartiality, and fit to exerciſe the critick upon hiſtories: he will needs have that paſſage of the biſhop of *Embrun* expunged, and thinks it moſt deſerves it of any in that moſt excellent book; but has no fault to find with this paſſage, tho' tis very evident the relater doubted of its credibility; which is one reaſon he before gave, why the other ſtory ſhould be expunged, even when there was nothing to ground his reaſon upon. *Eachard* intimates no ſuſpicion concerning the one, and yet it ought to be expunged; he expreſſes his ſuſpicion in the plaineſt words concerning the other; ſaith, he inſerts it *as a thing more wonderful* than probable; yet ſaith the critick, let this paſs: this is authentick: and is not this man wonderfully qualified to write againſt prejudice, presbyterian prejudice? had ſuch a ſtory been told in the *Memorial* againſt king *Charles* I, query whether he would not have thought it deſerved to be expunged. But 'tis time to return from this digreſſion.

3dly, Another thing he offers to vindicate king *James* from the ſuſpicion of popery, is what I my ſelf had ſaid concerning him; and here he's reſolved to bring me under the guilt of a contradiction: he mentions it, *p.* 34, where I take notice of ſome attempts, made to pervert king *James* to the romiſh religion, in queen *Elizabeth*'s time, but all in vain; and there he threatens me, but refers to this place, *p.* 38, for further chaſtiſment; where he brings me in ſpeaking of king *James*'s inclination to popery; upon which he asks "how is this "conſiſtent with what he had ſaid a few pages be"fore, where he informs us what attempts were made "to pervert him. I leave him to reconcile the incon"ſiſtence of theſe two (to me ſeemingly contradicto"ry) paſſages." Well, here's ſome relief however under the terror of his rod: the paſſages only *ſeem* contradictory,

tradictory, and ſeem ſo *to him*; I preſume they'll not ſeem ſo to any body elſe; I am ſure they don't to me. King *James* might have a greater diſlike of popery at the time referred to, than afterwards; or he might, whatever his real principles were, withſtand the attempts of thoſe that would pervert him to popery, when he had the crown of *England* in view (and therefore to be ſure would do nothing to prejudice his ſucceſſion) and yet afterwards incline to it. 'Tis evident, that as he endeavoured to keep in with queen *Elizabeth*, ſo he endeavoured alſo to ſecure an intereſt in the pope. An hiſtorian (Mr. *Wellwiſher* would call him learned, and authentick if for his purpoſe) informs us, * " That " they had for a long time hopes of his converſion at " *Rome*; which ſecret cardinal *Bellarmine* ſome time af- " ter blabb'd out; and in anſwer to one of his books, " took the freedom to reprove him of inconſtancy, " and reproached him with a letter to pope *Clement* viii. " from *Scotland*, wherein he had recommended to his " holineſs the biſhop of *Vaiſſon* for a cardinal's hat, that " ſo he might be better able to advance his affairs in " the court of *Rome:* indeed afterwards, when queen " *Elizabeth* had got notice of this letter, and expoſtu- " lated with king *James* about it in bitter terms, he " deny'd it with the moſt ſolemn oaths, and laid the " blame upon *Bellarmine:* but *Bellarmine*'s book brought " all to light; and it is remarkable, ſaith my author, " that tho' *Bellarmine* took the whole blame upon him- " ſelf, of writing the letter to the pope, yet he lived " till his dying day in an eaſy retreat, poſſeſs'd of his " whole fortune, and had the honour of ſeveral letters " from a maſter, it was pretended that he had diſobli-

* Comp. Hiſt. of *Eng.* Vol. 2. *p.* 666.

" ged in ſo tender a point." So that I really think the inconſiſtency is only in the head that form'd it; and that there is none in thoſe paſſages: king *James* might have inclination enough to popery, both before, and after he came to the crown, and yet not think it his intereſt to declare in favour of it; tho' after all, I ſay nothing in the page he refers to (*Memorial* 186) of any attempts to pervert king *James*, otherwiſe than by drawing him to join with popiſh princes againſt queen *Elizabeth*, and their offering him a match with the infanta of *Spain*, on condition of becoming a catholick, and taking part againſt queen *Elizabeth*; all which he might refuſe, and yet be the very ſame man, he afterwards appeared to be, or was ſuſpected to be.

I ſhall ſo far conſult my own eaſe, as to paſs over a page or two, which I dare ſay the reader may well want, and yet not ſuffer much in his learning; and ſhall proceed to his remark, *p.* 41. *It ſeems the king was ſo far flatter'd into an opinion of his own abſoluteneſs, that in anſwer to the commons remonſtrance, anno* 1629, *he expreſly tells them, he was not bound to give an account of his actions to any, but God only:* I have recited the words as they are in the *Memorial*, becauſe, as this author quotes them, they are nonſenſe: and here he undertakes to defend, prove, and do wonders. " I was really always " of opinion, ſaith he, that kings were accountable to " none for their actions but God only; if they are " *ſupreme* here upon earth, I would be glad to be in- " formed who can be their *ſuperiors:* I can't but think " that to be *ſupreme*, and yet to have *ſuperiors* at the " ſame time, implies ſomething like a contradiction." But if our author had thought of a diſtinction, not impertinent here, it might have prevented ſo weak a queſtion, and protected me from the charge of a contradiction, (*viz.*) between *ſupreme, and abſolute:* this gentleman, for ought I know, may be *ſupreme* in his own family; but I hope he is not *abſolute*, and unaccount-

countable for his actions. I verily think, ſhould he attempt to deſtroy his wife, children, or ſervants, they may call him to account, and reſiſt him, as ſupreme as he is; and are warranted by the laws of ſelf preſervation to do any thing neceſſary for their own defence. I preſume he will be hard put to it to prove, that the caſe is not the ſame in civil national governments as in families; to call governours *ſupreme*, and thence infer they are unaccountable to any on earth, is unaccountable weakneſs, and a childiſh trifling with the word. The *Roman* emperors were ſupreme; and yet 'tis known the ſenate thought they had a right to defend themſelves, and the community from their illegal incroachments and acts of tyranny; which they did particularly in *Nero*'s caſe, declaring him an enemy to the publick, and ordering him to be whipt to death. After our author has reaſoned in his uſual manner, and proved what is *ſupreme* can't have a *ſuperior*, he applies his doctrine to the kings of *England*, and tells us, that there are ſeveral paſſages in our common law books, and ſtatutes, which he thinks full for the proof of it: (*i. e.* that kings are not bound to give an account of their actions to any but God only) "*Bracton*,† ſaith he, the lord chief-juſtice in *Henry* "III reign, a perſon of very great authority with our "common lawyers, tells us, that neither the judges, nor "private perſons ought to take upon them to determine, "or diſpute upon the writs or actions of our kings, "(*de Chartis regiis* it is in *Bracton*, which he renders "writs or actions) and in another place * that every "one is inferior to the king, and he is inferior, or ſubject "to none but God only; he has not an equal in the "kingdom, for if he had, he would by that means looſe

† De leg. & conſuet. *Ang.* lib. 2. cap. 16. * lib. 1. cap. 8.

"his

" his ſuperiority." The concluſion this gentleman would draw from hence is, that the kings of *England* are, according to *Bracton*, abſolute. Now as this is his great point, and this the only time he has ſpoke a word of ſenſe to it, *i. e.* by drawing *Bracton* into his cauſe, I ſhall take ſome notice of what is offered in behalf of his notion, *that ſupreme governours, as ſupreme, are abſolute, and unaccountable*; *and that the kings of* England *are ſo*; to which I have ſeveral things to ſay.

1ſt, That its perfectly inconſiſtent with the known conſtitution of our government, and contrary to all thoſe laws, that fix and limit the prerogative. (2dly,) That this can't be *Bracton*'s ſenſe is evident, from the reaſon he gives for his aſſertion, in the very chapter the gentleman has quoted. Lib. 1. chap. 8. *Ipſe autem rex non debet eſſe ſub homine, ſed ſub Deo & ſub lege; quia lex facit regem: attribuat ergo rex legi quod lex attribuit ei,* viz. *Dominationem & poteſtatem: non eſt enim rex, ubi dominatur voluntas & non lex; & quod ſub lege eſſe debeat, cum ſit Dei vicarius, evidenter apparet ad exemplum Jeſu Chriſti, cujus vices gerit in terra,* &c. *qui noluit uti viribus, ſed ratione & judicio:* " The king ought not " to be ſubject to man, but to God and the law, becauſe " the law conſtitutes the king: let the king therefore " give to the law, what the law gives him: (*viz.*) go- " vernment and power; *for he is no king, that governs ar- " bitrarily and not according to law:* 'tis evident, he ought " to be ſubject to law, and govern by it, ſince he is " God's vicar, *&c.*" And doth not this gentleman eſtabliſh his point notably, by *Bracton*'s authority, when *Bracton* aſcribes no power to the king, but what the law gives him; and aſſerts, that when he neglects the law, and ſets up his own will inſtead of it, he ceaſes to be a king? *non eſt enim rex, ubi dominatur voluntas, & non lex:* and elſewhere he repreſents him as the miniſter of Satan, inſtead of God's vicegerent, when he forgets the end

end of his office and turns an oppreſſor: *Poteſtas ſua juris eſt, non injuriæ*, ſaith he, *exercere igitur debet rex poteſtatem juris, ſicut dei vicarius & miniſter in terra; quia illa poteſtas ſolius dei eſt: poteſtas autem injuriæ, diaboli & non Dei; & cujus horum opera fecerit rex, ejus miniſter eſt cujus opera fecerit; igitur dum facit juſtitiam, vicarius eſt regis æterni; miniſter autem diaboli, cum declinet ad injuriam. i. e.* in ſhort, All the power a king has, as it's given him by law, as he ſaid before, ſo it is ohly a power to do what is juſt and right, but not to injure and oppreſs; and that he is either God's miniſter or the devil's, according as he uſes his power. And elſewhere he ſpeaks more plainly, in direct contradiction to our learned author, (*vid. lib. 2. cap. 16. ſect. 3.*) *Rex autem habet ſuperiorem Deum, item legem, item curiam ſuam*, viz. *comites, barones*, &c. "The king has a ſu-"perior, God, the law by which he is made king, "and his court, (i. e.) the earls and barons, who "are called *comites*, as being the companions of the "king; and he that hath a companion, hath a ma-"ſter; and therefore, if the king ſhall be unbridled "and lawleſs, they ought to bridle him." I cannot but obſerve, how well this learned lawyer accords with the apoſtle, *Rom.* 13. in the reaſons he gives for obedience to the higher powers, and ſubjection to the magiſtrate (*viz. That he is not a terror to good works, but to the evil: and that he is the miniſter of God for good*) And what an admirable uſe Mr. *Wellwiſher* makes of the authority, both of the one and the other: he tells us, *p.* 11. That non-reſiſtence, and paſſive obedience (*i. e.* to the mere will and pleaſure of tyrants; for none defend the reſiſting of kings) can never be baſled, ſo long as the 13th of *Romans* ſtands upon record, as part of the canon of ſcripture: where he infers abſolute ſubjection due to tyrants, *miniſtri diaboli*, as *Bracton* calls them, from the apoſtle's enjoining it as due to good princes, *vicarii dei*. In the ſame manner he perverts *Bracton*, and

abuſes

abuſes his reader: kings are ſupreme, unaccountable, and abſolute according to *Bracton*, and yet *Bracton* expreſly aſſerts, that when they govern arbitrarily, when their will rules, not the law, they are no kings. The gentleman cites ſome ſtatutes, as 16 *Richard* ii. c. 55. 1 *Eliz.* c. 1. 12 *Car.* ii. c. 30. which really have nothing for him, but what the ſound of the words affords: he can't but know the very advocates of his cauſe have allowed (particularly at Dr. *Sacheverel*'s trial) that thoſe laws, however expreſſed in general terms, are to be underſtood with exception for caſes of the utmoſt neceſſity; and thus the greateſt lawyers of the nation have expounded them. The laws are framed upon a view of ordinary and common caſes, ſaith a noted man in that profeſſion: if our legiſlators had been asked, whether they meant by thoſe laws, ſuch as are mentioned above, to make all other laws, and even thoſe laws themſelves of no validity, (which, if ſupreme power can't be withſtood, would be the certain conſequence) would they not have anſwered, nothing was farther from their thoughts? and if it be *maledicta expoſitio quæ corrumpit textum*, apply'd to any particular law, what a curſed expoſition muſt that be which corrupts, or rather annuls the text of all the laws at once: but whatever ſenſe any advocates for ſlavery are inclined to put upon ſuch ſtatutes, they are now out of date; the revolution was a publick national interpretation of them, in contradiction to theſe gentlemens notions; and the laws made ſince have ſuperſeded them: witneſs the act made 1 *W. and M.* for abrogating the oaths of ſupremacy and allegiance, and the act for declaring the rights and liberties of the ſubject.

I add, 3dly, That this can not be the ſenſe of the chriſtian church, or of the church of *England*; that they do not apprehend kings in general, or their kings to be abſolute and unaccountable, appears from their practice and conduct towards them: we have abundance of inſtances in hiſtory of *chriſtian* princes

princes taking up arms, to aſſiſt the ſubjects of neighbouring princes and governments, when groaning under the oppreſſions of their rulers. Thus *Conſtantine* the great oppoſed *Maxentius*, and made war againſt him, as having tyranniz'd over the *Romans*; and for the ſame reaſon invaded *Lycinius*; we find him alſo threatning the king of *Perſia* with a war, when he perſecuted the *chriſtians*, in caſe he did not deſiſt; and if theſe examples be thought foreign, we have ſeveral of our own nation to the ſame purpoſe: queen *Elizabeth* ſcrupled not to aſſiſt, and protect proteſtants of neighbouring ſtates; as the *Scotch*, *Dutch*, *French*, againſt the illegal invaſions of their ſovereigns; which the clergy of the church of *England* at that time were ſo far from condemning, that they declared it glorious (to aſſiſt oppreſs'd ſubjects againſt their princes) and gave ſeveral large ſubſidies for that purpoſe: 'tis well known what king *James* the firſt did for the prince *Palatine*, king *Charles* the firſt for the relief of the *Rochellers*, and queen *Anne* for the *Catalans*. 'Tis plain the *Engliſh* nation did not think that princes, *tho' ſupreme*, were abſolute; but might upon occaſion, be called to account and reſiſted; not left to the judgment of God in another world, but be chaſtiſed in this; why elſe did they encourage their ſubjects to withſtand them, and joyn their arms for their aſſiſtance? I beg leave to put this worthy man in mind, that not long ſince, the main body of the kingdom gave their publick ſuffrages againſt the doctrine he is ſo zealous for; and confuted his principle in a very effectual manner; which had they not done, all that a chriſtian and a proteſtant knows how to value, had probably been loſt at once; ſlavery and miſery of every kind had been left as the portion, and puniſhment of poſterity, and a mark of their father's folly; I mean at the *revolution*: my friend, I grant, ſeems to have forgotten this; for when I ſpeak of *non-reſiſtance* as being baffled, he ſaith, he ſuppoſes that I mean no more than

this, that *once* it was baſled by a fatal ſucceſsful rebellion in 41. But pray, Sir, has it never been baſled ſince that time? have you never read, nor heard any of your neighbours ſpeak of another fatal ſucceſsful *ſomething* in 88? It may be our author has learnt to talk after his chief, Dr. *Sacheverel*, and deny there was any reſiſtance then; and if he be ſo diſpos'd, I ſhan't diſturb his dream; but am ſatisfy'd, all men awake, and in their ſenſes own reſiſtance at that time: ſo that I think it manifeſt, whatever this gentleman weakly infers from kings being ſtyl'd *ſupreme* governours, and alleges from our law-books in behalf of their *abſoluteneſs*, and in ſupport of *non-reſiſtance*, that the doctrine it ſelf is a mere whim, inconſiſtent with the law of nature, the ſafety and very being of ſociety, contrary to the law of the land, the frequent practice of our own, and other chriſtian nations, utterly ſubverſive of the preſent government, and I may add, what will involve this gentleman, if he be a miniſter of the eſtabliſhed church, in the guilt of perjury.

Mr. *Wellwiſher* perhaps will complain, if I over-look any thing he has advanced, and that he may think of importance, for the ſupport of his cauſe; therefore I ſhall take notice, that *p.* 11. he brings a quotation from *Tyndale* for his purpoſe; it is the inſtance of *David* not killing † *Saul, when God had delivered him into his hands, and his heart ſmiting him, becauſe he cut off his garment*; whereby, ſaith *Tindale*, " ſeeſt thou that a king is in this " world without law, and may, at his luſt, do right " or wrong, he ſhall give an account to no one, but " God only;" our author adds, " this may ſuffice to " ſhew what opinion our *martyrs*, and firſt *reformers*

† 1 *Sam.* 24.

" had

" had of this exploded doctrine." But I ask, how doth this ſhew the opinion of our *martyrs?* 'tis only the opinion of one of them: elſewhere he complains, when he only imagines without grounds, that the opinion of one, or two, is imputed to a whole party. I ask farther, will he ſubmit, to the opinions of the *reformers* in every particular? if ſo, he muſt give up the divine right of epiſcopacy. Mr. *Tindale*, nor any of the reſt of the *reformers* were infallible; we eſteem them as wiſe and good men, as ſuch reverence them; but when they give their judgment, and reaſon upon the doctrines of religion, the principle, they went upon in the reformation, we think, will warrant our examining what they ſay, and diſſenting from them, when we ſee cauſe; which is the caſe here: and indeed Mr. *Tindale*'s inſtance, and the argument he draws from it, doth not conclude to the purpoſe: 'tis certain, *David* took up arms in his own defence, and no queſtion would have uſed them againſt *Saul* for that purpoſe, whenever he ſaw occaſion: he ſeems prepared to have done ſo particularly at *Keilah*, 1 *Sam.* 23. ſo that I can't but think, that as *Tindale*'s reaſoning here is wrong, his authority is nothing; nor doth Mr. *Welhviſher* regard it any more than I, but when 'tis for his purpoſe.

I know not whether he will expect I ſhou'd take notice of his *harangue*, *p.*39. " The loyal clergy, ſaith " he, took the king's part, and it was their duty ſo " to do; nay, they had been no better than rebels, had " they done otherwiſe; they engaged on his ſide, becauſe " the juſtifiable ſide of the cauſe; and they knew it " was their duty to adhere to him in point of honour " and conſcience, on that very account; for they muſt " have been forced to have renounced their faith, be- " fore they could have forſaken ſo good and gracious " a prince; their loyalty and religion ſtood upon the

" very ſame foot, and they were *martyrs* as well as " *ſoldiers* in his cauſe, and for his ſervice; *this is the* " *peculiar genius, and theſe the diſtinguiſhing principles of* " *the church of England!* and ſo far as they are ad- " mitted into the minds of men, ſo far they work " in them this religious, and awful regard to ſove- " reign princes." I can't but obſerve, that we have the very ſame paſſage, and almoſt in the very ſame words, in a pamphlet, call'd, *a vindication of the church of England* (part the 1ſt, *p.* 141.) who the author of that performance is, I don't pretend to ſay; but I have met with no body that has look'd into him, who doth not think him one of the moſt inſipid ſenſeleſs writers, that ever waſted paper; and yet 'tis ſtrange to ſee what uſe this gentleman makes of him; he quotes the ſame authorities all along; borrows whole paragraphs from him, and often tranſcribes from him *verbatim*: Indeed, 'tis ſcarce poſſible for a man to play the plagiary more, than he has done with that pamphlet; and yet I don't find he has once quoted him: what reaſon can be given for this he beſt knows; it may be it was, that he knew not well how to beſtow any of his uſual epithets of honour upon ſuch a ſcribler; and therefore tho' he has plunder'd him upon every occaſion, finding a large number of ſcurrilous collections in him for his purpoſe, yet he was aſhamed to mention him. As for the paſſage now before us, it doth not pretend to any argument in behalf of the doctrine, only applauds the church of *England* for their zealous adhering to it: but what reaſon he has to be aſhamed of this confident boaſting, any one may judge that remembers the revolution. Indeed before that time, we heard enough of non-reſiſtance, and the awful regard he talks of to ſovereign princes; but he knows, and all the world know, theſe loyaliſts, he ſo much extols, recanted their own doctrine when it came to be applyed againſt them, and ſhow'd, whatever regard they pretended to ſovereign princes, they had a greater

regard

regard to their own own intereſt. In ſhort, as the church of *England* then ſeem'd convinc'd they had carried matters too far, and therefore made a retreat, and took leave of this enſlaving doctrine; ſo there are few modeſt men among them, but now give it up as utterly indefenſible, upon the principles of the preſent eſtabliſhment: and I can't but think that Mr. *Welhviſher*, whilſt he is thus catching hold of the doctrine, and endeavouring to bring it back again, as a peculiar diſtinguiſhing principle of the church of *England*, really libels the church, whatever he intends.

P. 43. *But he was ſo arbitrary in his proceedings againſt Mr.* Cancey *the miniſter of* Ware, *Mr.* Sherfield *recorder of* Sarum, *and Mr.* Workman *a miniſter of* Gloceſter, *in the high commiſſion court.* Now hear Mr. *Welhviſher*; "And good reaſon, I take it for granted, he had for "being ſo;" for being *arbitrary*, the word himſelf makes uſe of, *i. e.* good reaſon for acting without reaſon; "and he has vindicared himſelf excellently well from "that charge:" how vindicated? don't you grant he was *arbitrary*, and had reaſon to be ſo; and yet now ſay, he has vindicated himſelf againſt the charge?

P. 44, he quotes the *Mem.* as ſaying, that the papiſts had ſuch an opinion of *Laud*'s diſpoſition to popery, that they twice offered him a *Cardinal*'s cap; upon which he asks, "and was not his refuſing of it ſufficient to con-"vince, even our author himſelf, that he was no pa-"piſt?" And after mentioning his book againſt *Fiſher* the *jeſuit*, as what might ſilence the clamours of any one, not directly prejudic'd in this caſe, he adds, "'tis a juſt obſervation, as upon ſome that liv'd in "thoſe times, ſo on ſeveral in this (and our hiſtorian "for one) who ſaid, (an obſervation who ſaid!) the "biſhop might print what he would againſt popery, "yet they would not believe him to be leſs a papiſt

"for

" for all that." How ingenous and modeſt is this? he inſinuates as much, as that I was not to be perſuaded that the biſhop was no papiſt; and yet immediately after the paſſage he here falls upon, I take notice, *that the learned book he writ againſt* Fiſher, *ſhews he had a great deal to ſay againſt popery; and though he often ſet his face ſo, as many thought he was bound for* Rome, *yet it may be, he never deſign'd for above half the way.* Memorial, *p.* 232.

P. 47. *Nothing was more offenſive to the ſobereſt part of the nation, than the infamous book of ſports, which muſt be publiſhed by the miniſters in the churches.* " If by the ſo-" bereſt, ſaith our author, he means the diſſenters of what " kind or denomination ſoever, I grant that it might be " offenſive to them;" ſo that it's plain he ſuppoſes all church-men were pleaſed with the book of ſports, and that none but diſſenters, *i. e. fanaticks*, found fault with it: I doubt not, there are a great many ſober church-men at this day that will call him ſlanderer, as there were many then that took offence at that book: but he tells us " the ſabbatarian doctrine was preached " up then; that 'twas aſſerted that the ſabbath was to " be obſerved with the ſame ſtrictneſs, that it was obſer-" ved by the *Jews*; that to make a feaſt, or dreſs a " wedding dinner on that day was as great a ſin, as for " a father to take a knife, and cut his ſon's throat." If there were any ſuch crack-brain'd caſuiſts, ſurely they were but few, and therefore but little to be regarded: he mentions only one *Brabourn*: If there were many, there was the more reaſon to employ the ſabbath in inſtructing ſo ſtupid a people; they ſhould not methinks have been ſent to play, when their circumſtances made it ſo neceſſary they ſhou'd be at church, or at their book: This *Brabourn*, it ſeems, publiſh'd a book in defence of it, in which he aſſerted, " That the Lord's day was an " ordinary working day; and of conſequence, that the

" *Jewiſh*

" *Jewiſh* ſabbath ought to be obſerved as ſuch; and had " the confidence to dedicate it to the king. His ma- " jeſty was ſo extremely moved at ſo unparalelled an " impudence, and fearing to be thought the patron of " a doctrine, ſo abhorrent from all chriſtian piety, he " *ordered his father's declaration for lawful ſports to* " *be printed.*" I ſhould really have taken this to have been our author's own account of the matter (the reaſon here given is ſo like one of his) but for his inverted commas". *Brabourn* maintains, that the Lord's day was an ordinary working day; that the *Jewiſh* ſabbath ought to be obſerved as ſuch; this angered the king exceedingly; and therefore to free himſelf of all ſuſpicion of favouring this doctrine, he publiſhes the book of ſports. I know not what to make of it but this; *that he could not bear* Brabourn *ſhould turn it into a working day, and therefore he turns it into a play-day:* or, if *Brabourn* pleaded for *ſaturday* to be kept as a ſabbath, and with the ſame ſtrictneſs as the *Jews* kept it, and this rais'd the reſentment in his majeſty's breaſt, I can't imagine, how the book of ſports was any antidote againſt ſuch a doctrine; it had no tendency to confute the notion of the ſeventh day's being the ſabbath; and, methinks, it was a very unhappy way of correcting the ſtrictneſs of the *Jewiſh* reſt throughout the day, to give licence to play the greateſt part of it: this author however thinks it was well done; and that, circumſtances conſidered, the liberty granted, and the reſtraints laid down, all contained therein proceeded from a truly chriſtian diſpoſition: and he may think as he pleaſes; few, I am perſuaded, that know no more of him than from this work, will lay much ſtreſs on his thoughts.

After

After this author has been anſwering the *Memorial* in his manner, *i. e.* trifling with a few ſentences up and down for between 2 and 300 pages, he comes at laſt, *p.* 52. to a paſſage that I grant material; nor can I take it amiſs to be attack'd here; tho' had it been by one more capable of doing juſtice, either to the argument or my ſelf, I had been better pleaſed: the point he falls upon is the *Iriſh Rebellion*; which he thinks I have (with a very ill deſign) made the king acceſſary to: and I own, a perſon of greater equity, and candour than Mr. *Wellwiſher*, that has a zeal for the cauſe, might not only diſſent from me here, but find fault: nor ſhould I have complain'd of any one's oppoſition or reproof, that knew how to keep within the rules of juſtice; that would truly repreſent what I ſay, and the occaſion upon which I ſay it: for whatever falſhood, faction, malice, or any thing elſe that is bad, ſome may ſuppoſe in the matter (*i. e.* charging the *Iriſh rebellion* and *maſſacre* upon the king) I flatter my ſelf it will be no great difficulty to clear the *Memorial* of it: I need only deſire the reader to peruſe the account there given, and I dare ſay, he'll acquit me in a great meaſure; and allow that this gentleman's cenſures are, as uſually, at random and without grounds: the plain caſe with him I take to be this, that I having ſaid ſomething on the ſubject, and he having a ſmall ſtock of materials upon the ſame ſubject, either in his common-place-book, or in his hackney pamphlets, he was reſolv'd to go to work with them; and therefore ſuppoſes me to ſay what I don't; and makes me ſay what his furniture requir'd. I'll obſerve a few things to the reader, which will ſhow him how far I have intereſted my ſelf in this affair. And,

Firſt,

First, That I mention the ſtory of the *Iriſh* maſſacre, only as one occaſion of increaſing the jealouſie between king and parliament: *It unhappily fell out* (Memorial, *p.* 261.) *at this time whilſt the king was in* Scotland, *endeavouring to ſet things right there, the news of the* Iriſh *maſſacre reached the parliament, in which between two and three hundred thouſand proteſtants were murthered in the moſt inhumane barbarous manner.* I add, *p.* 264. *This fact ſo much raiſed the fears of the nation, and the dread of the papiſts, that it was thought requiſite the parliament (the king being abſent in* Scotland) *ſhould put the nation in a poſture of defence; and it is paſt doubt, that this muſt be reckoned among the many things, that at that time fell out ſtrangely, to haſten the violence the nation was threatned with.*

Secondly, It may be obſerved, that I never charge the king poſitively with the fact; I ſay, the rebels *pretended* the kings commiſſion for what they did, and produced a commiſſion with the king's broad-ſeal to it; but how they came by it is the queſtion; adding, 'tis commonly ſaid, they got it out of *Farnham Abby*, from an old writing; and fix'd it to their commiſſion they ſhew'd: and I farther ſay, many will think it no other than a forgery, deſigned on purpoſe by the papiſts, to make the king odious, and inflame the differences between king and parliament; adding, the ſecret of this, and ſome other things of the like nature, muſt be left for ought I know, to the light of a future judgment: 'tis evident that I aſſert nothing, but leave the matter doubtful and in ſuſpence; and at the cloſe of the paſſage relating to the marqueſso f Antrim, *I own, that it has been looked upon as a mere forgery; and declare, I had rather it was falſe than true.*

Thirdly, Conſidering for what purpoſe this ſtory was told, only as an occaſion of inflaming the quarrels, and bringing things to an extremity between king and parliament, and that I pretended to determine nothing concerning it, but leave it as an uncertainty to a future judgment, I can't ſee I was obliged by the laws of hiſtory, to recite the evidences alleged againſt it; and therefore I do not think this gentleman's harangue upon this head much to the purpoſe; it is indeed ſo curious, that I would tranſcribe it, but for filling the paper too much: if the reader turn to it, *p.* 52. he will find this worthy perſon loudly complaining here, and zealouſly pleading for a ſtrict impartiality, as an abſolutely neneceſſary qualification in all writers, eſpecially hiſtorians; which is granted; *ſed omnia non decent omnes*; theſe things ſcarce come well out of his mouth, *turpe eſt doctori*, &c. it is not eaſy to find a writer more under the power of bigotry, prejudice, and other low paſſions, than himſelf; even at the very inſtant he is raiſing a cry againſt others: thus he tells us "I have left out the principal paſſages of "the ſtory, and thoſe the trueſt (*i. e.* ſuch as he finds in his authentick writers) "that I have "given but what was ſaid on one ſide of the queſ- "tion, and that by no better authors than down- "right *republicans*; and what has been confronted "by *better* evidences; and fully confuted an hun- "dred times." Strange, the man ſhould talk in this ſtrain, whilſt he is declaring againſt partiality, and nothing ſtare him in the face! but this is his manner; he conſtantly brands with one or other nick-name, every body that doth not breath the ſpirit of his faction: the gentlemen that have uſed to relate ſome of theſe paſſages, whoſe credit he deſigns to deſtroy by calling them *republicans*, have given as good proof of their veracity, as any of their neigh-

neighbours; and, I may add, of their loyalty, according to the principles of the *Engliſh* government; and are againſt monarchy only in the ſenſe this author is for it, *i. e.* they are for a limited, legal monarchy, though not for an abſolute *jure divino* monarchy, that figment of idle heads: and yet he thinks it enough to diſgrace them as hiſtorians, or in any other capacity, to term them *republicans*. He goes on, "ſuch criminal omiſſions as theſe can "be of no other uſe (than as plainly deſign'd by "our author) but to abuſe and miſguide his rea-"ders;" of no other uſe *than but!* I paſs over the nonſenſe of this; for was I to collect every thing of that kind that occurs, I muſt prepare an index, like that our author has preſcribed for another edition of the *Memorial*, (*viz.*) to hold an infinite number of *blunders*. What I find fault with here is, that Mr. *Wellwiſher* ſhould ſo ſhamefully forget his own doctrine, and ſhow himſelf ſcandalously partial, when he is laying down the ſevereſt rules of impartiality; my ſtory deſerves no credit, "being told by no "better authors than *republicans*; what is ſaid againſt "it I *deſignedly* omit, on purpoſe to abuſe my "readers." How fit is this gentleman to reprove others, and ſtand as an example of impartiality!

I'm willing to add, *Fourthly*, that had I not ſuſpected there might be ſome truth in this ſtory, it reflects ſo much diſhonour on king *Charles*'s memory, that I ought not to have inſerted it in the *Memorial*, without ſignifying my disbelief of it; and that if I gave the evidences on the one ſide, I ought to have produced the evidences on the other: this I think impartiality would have required: but the reader will obſerve for what purpoſe I mention it; that I don't undertak either to proveor diſprove it, but leave it doubtful. The other paſſage

about the marqueſs of *Antrim*, &c. I cite only as confirming the ſuſpicions of ſome; tho' after all, could I believe the glorious things, which many greater men than our author have ſaid of king *Charles*, I ſhould think ſuch a ſtory as incredible as they do, and the repeating it highly injurious; but tho' I do ſuppoſe him to have been a much better man than ſome of his family, that went before and ſucceeded him, I can by no means think him the extraordinary perſon, they repreſent him to be; much leſs the beſt of kings: In ſhort, though I have not, and do not pretend to determine any thing in this matter, yet I freely own, I ſtill have my ſuſpicion, that king *Charles* was acceſſary to the *Iriſh* rebellion: not that I believe he gave the rebels a commiſſion to riſe and cut throats; aſſaſſinate and murder their neighbours, after the manner they did; but that they had authority, either directly from his majeſty, or by his queen and miniſters to take up arms. And as this is a point that has occaſioned great clamours againſt a ſort of men, whom our author ſtiles *republicans*; who are frequently charged with unreaſonable prejudice, and outragious malice to the royal martyr, as murdering him over again in his memory, &c. I ſhall a little conſider it; and enquire into the grounds of ſuſpicion on the one hand, and the evidences on the other ſide, brought for the king's vindication. Mr. *Wellwiſher* muſt excuſe me, if I leave him for awhile, and attend another author, who as he has diſcuſs'd this matter much more fully than himſelf, ſo he talks more intelligibly: I mean Mr. *Thomas Carte*, miniſter at the *Bath*: this gentleman wrote a pamphlet on purpoſe to clear king *Charles* from the aſperſions caſt upon him, as having an hand in the *Iriſh* maſſacre; where he undertakes to prove, that he could not be acceſſary

to

to it; and, at large, endeavours to confute the ſtory of the *marqueſs of Antrim.* I ſhall conſider what he has ſaid: but before I proceed to that, I ſhall, as was propoſed, take notice of ſome things, which remain with me as matter of ſuſpicion, that king *Charles*, or ſome others acting in his name, or by his authority, were acceſſary to the *Iriſh* rebellion: and what I here offer, I deſire may be conſidered, only as a neceſſary apology for my ſelf and others, who are ſo ſeverely accuſed for mentioning this fact, and intereſting the king in it: the reader will remember, that I don't ſuppoſe the king gave a commiſſion to the *Iriſh* rebels, for the purpoſe they us'd it, and for the work they did; all that I ſuppoſe is, *that he might encourage, and authorize them to take up arms, and aſſiſt him in the circumſtances he was then in:* this I own I do ſuſpect, and my reaſons for it are ſuch as follow.

Firſt, It it is of ſome weight with me that ſo many perſons of eminency and note in the nation, did *at that time* apprehend the king, or ſome about him were concerned in this matter; and theſe not *knaves, fools, and republicans* (to borrow a ſet of fine words, from my friend the *Welhviſher*) ſuch as were enemies to the king and monarchy; but wiſe, great, and good men; zealous for their king, and country; and deſirous to ſee both intereſts united; that beheld the calamities of the kingdom, with the tenderneſs and reſentment that became *Engliſhmen*, proteſtants, and chriſtians: this gentleman, and others, may call them by what names they pleaſe; it will have little impreſſion on me; I ſhall believe concerning perſons and things, as I find reaſon, and not according to their cenſures and dictates: that ſeveral of this character, who had the beſt opportunities of obſerving publick occurrences,

rences, had the ſame ſuſpicion, to ſay no more, concerning the abetters of the *Iriſh* rebellion, is too well known to need any proof; a zealous loyaliſt, that afterwards loſt his life in the cauſe of the royal family, I mean Mr. *Love*, preaching at *Uxbridge*, when the treaty there was depending; and ſpeaking of ſearching into the cauſe of the miſeries of the nation, mentions ſundry things, which he intimates would not bear a through examination; and among the reſt ſaith, *it would go to the quick to find out, whether the* Iriſh *rebellion was not plotted, promoted, and contrived in* England, *and by whom*: but not to mention the opinions of particular perſons, which would be endleſs, we find the parliament of *England* freely expreſſing their ſentiments, with reference to this point: thus in their declaration to the king at *Newmarket*, ſent by the earls of *Pembroke* and *Holland*, and a commitee of the houſe of commons (in which they repreſent to his majeſty the cauſes of their fears and jealouſies) they mention theſe among other particulars. " *Firſt*, " That the deſign of altering religion had been " potently carried on, by thoſe of the greateſt au- " thority about him; the queen's agent at *Rome*, " the pope's nuncio here, are not only evidences " of this deſign, but have been great actors in it. " *Secondly*, That the war with *Scotland* was pro- " cured to make way for this intent; and chief- " ly fomented by the papiſts, and others popiſhly " affected, whereof we have many evidences. " *Thirdly*, That *the rebellion in* Ireland, *was fram'd* " *and contrived here in* England; and that the " *Engliſh* papiſts ſhould have riſen about the ſame " time, we have ſeveral teſtimonies: the *Iriſh* rebels " affirm, that they do nothing but by authority " from the king: they call themſelves the queen's " army; the booty which they take from the

" *Engliſh*

" *Engliſh* they mark with the queen's mark; and it " is proved, their purpoſe was to come to *Eng-* " *land*, after they had done in *Ireland*."

When things were brought to extremity, and the parliament had raiſed an army, and choſen the earl of *Eſſex* for their general; they drew up a petition to the king, to be delivered to him by the earl, wherein they expreſs themſelves thus: " We " can't but with great grief and tenderneſs of " compaſſion, behold the preſſing miſeries, the e- " minent dangers, the devouring calamities, which " do extreamly threaten the kingdoms of *England* " and *Ireland*, by the practice of a party prevail- " ing with your majeſty; who by many plots and " conſpiracies, have attempted the alteration of the " true religion, and the antient government of " this kingdom, and the introducing of popiſh " idolatry and ſuperſtition in the church, and ty- " ranny, and confuſion in the ſtate: and for the " compaſſing thereof, have long corrupted your " majeſty's councils, abuſed your power, and by " ſudden and untimely diſſolving of the former " parliaments, have often hindred the reformation, " and prevention of theſe miſchiefs; and being " now diſabled to avoid the endeavours of this " parliament by any ſuch means, have traiterouſly " attempted to overcome the ſame by force; and " in proſecution of their wicked deſigns, *have ex-* " *cited, encouraged and foſtered an unnatural rebelli-* " *on in* Ireland; do ſeek to bring over the rebels " in *Ireland*, to join with them, *&c.*" Now tho' it will be eaſy to ſet aſide, and ſlur all this by calling theſe men *rebels*, regicides, *&c.* yet with thoſe that look upon them under a different character, and think them as good patriots as any age has produced, and true loyaliſts, according to the

Engliſh

Engliſh conſtitution, their teſtimony muſt have it weight; and I own has more weight with me, than a great many things alleged on the other ſide from the jeſuiſt *Orleans*, and a number of ſuch pamphleteers, as Mr. *Wellwiſher* trades with.

Secondly, It is obſervable, that before the *Iriſh* rebellion, the parliament ſeemed apprehenſive the king deſigned violence againſt them: the army raiſed againſt the *Scots*, and that lay in the north undisbanded, gave umbrage: they afterwards found, as they apprehended and remonſtrated, that it was to be employed againſt them, to reduce them to the king's meaſures: ſeveral were concerned in this conſpiracy, as the parliament called it; and among the reſt *Jermin*, the queen's great favourite, *O Neal*, an *Iriſh* papiſt, *&c.* "Theſe (as one gives the account, that lived in thoſe times, and who was well acquainted with publick occurences) "had taken an oath of ſecrecy among themſelves, to "join with this army, and ſtrengthen the plot, a "*French* army was to be landed at *Portſmouth*; "which town for that purpoſe, was to be put into *Jermin*'s hands; and the *Iriſh* army, conſiſting of eight thouſand, almoſt all papiſts, was "to be brought over: upon the diſcovery of this "plot *Piercy*, *Jermin* and *Suckling* fled into *France*; "*Goring* being taken made an ingenuous confeſſion, and ſo was diſcharged: *O Neal*, *Wilmot*, *Aſhburnham*, and others were committed to the tower; from whence *O Neal* was permitted to make "his eſcape: Colonel *Goring* confeſſed upon his "examination, that *Jermin* carried him to the king; "who asked him, if he was engaged in any cabal "againſt the army; to which *Goring* anſwered he "was not; the king ſaid, I command you then "to join your ſelf with *Piercy*, and ſome others whom

" whom you will find with him at his lodgings;
" that he thereupon went, and found with *Piercy*
" *Wilmot*, *O Neal*, and others; and having taken an
" oath of ſecrecy, which the others had taken be-
" fore, ſeveral propoſitions were made: among the
" reſt one by *Jermin*, that the army ſhould be
" brought immediately to *London*, and they ſhould
" make ſure of the town. Colonel *Ballard* and cap-
" tain *Chudleigh* confeſſed, that the *French* that were
" about *London*, were to be mounted, and to join
" with the army; and *Chudleigh* added, that the
" queen had ſent down money to fortify *Portſ-*
" *mouth*. It farther appeared, adds my author, by
" the confeſſions of Sir *Jacob Aſhley*, and others,
" eminent commanders in the king's army, that *O-*
" *Neal*, the *Iriſh* papiſt, was a principal agent in
" carrying on their intreague of working upon
" the army, to engage them againſt the parlia-
" ment." All that I mention this ſtory for, is to ſhew, that the king was for uſing force of arms againſt the parliament, and for calling in foreign aſſiſtance; *ſome of them from Ireland*, before the rebellion there broke out, which no queſtion, increaſed the ſuſpicion at that time, and, I think, may warrant it ſince, that he, or ſome for him, might encourage the *Iriſh* inſurrection, for the ſame purpoſe, *i. e.* to aſſiſt him againſt the parliament of *England*; eſpecially ſince *O Neal*, an *Iriſh* papiſt, one of the perſons, I ſuppoſe, ſo much diſtinguiſhed afterwards in the *Iriſh* rebellion, was not only concerned in this affair, but of the cabinet.

Thirdly, 'Tis known the queen had very great influence, not to ſay the *aſcendant* in the king's councels; had the utmoſt confidence with him; was intruſted with all his ſecrets, and employ-

ed in negotiating for him, both at home and abroad; he conſulted her even in the choice of his miniſters and ſervants, and ſeemed unwilling to do any thing, in that matter, that might not be agreeable to her. "I intend, ſaith he, in one of "his * letters, to beſtow *Piercy*'s place on M. of "*New caſtle*, *If thou like it*; to whom yet I "am no way engaged, nor will before I have "thy anſwer." He makes an apology to her for calling thoſe at *London* a parliament, and tells † her, "the argument that prevail'd with him to do "it was, that the calling them ſo, did no ways "acknowledge them to be a parliament." When the treaty at *Uxbridge* was agreed upon, ſhe writes to the king (*January* 1644.) and deſires him, "not to abandon thoſe that had ſerved him, leaſt "they forſake him in his need; that ſhe hopes "he would have a care of her and her religion; "that it is her opinion, religion ſhould be the "laſt thing, upon which he ſhould treat: for "if he doth agree upon ſtrictneſs againſt the ca-"tholicks, it would diſcourage them to ſerve him; "and if afterwards there ſhould be no peace, he "could never expect ſuccours, either from *Ire-*"*land*, or any other catholick prince." That ſhe was employed to procure foreign aſſiſtance from the papiſts, is evident: thus ſhe writes to his majeſty, (*Jan. 7th* 1644.) "I received yeſterday "letters from the *Duke of Lorrain*, who ſends "me word, if his ſervice be agreeable to you, he "will bring you ten thouſand men, *&c.* Above "all have a care not to abandon thoſe who have "ſerved you; as well the *biſhops as the poor ca-*

---

* From *Oxford*, *March* 27. 1645. † Letter from *Oxford*. *Jan.* 2*d*, 1645.

"*tholicks*."

" *tholicks.*" And that nothing might be wanting to enable the queen to carry on her treaties with ſucceſs, the king writes to her, and tells her, (*March the 5th*, 1645.) " I have thought of one " means more to furniſh thee for my aſſiſtance, " than hitherto thou haſt had; it is that I give " thee power to promiſe in my name (to whom " thou thinkeſt moſt fit) that I will take away " all penal laws againſt the *Roman* catholicks in " *England*, aſſoon as God ſhall enable me to do " it; ſo as by their means I may have ſo pow- " erful aſſiſtance, as may deſerve ſo great a favour, " and enable me to do it." And that the queen made uſe of theſe encouragements (did negotiate and treat with the *Roman* catholicks abroad) can't be queſtioned. She did ſo particularly with the *Iriſh:* this appears from one of the king's letters, in which, it ſeems, he had given her ſome cautions, or inſtructions concerning her management: " I find, ſaith he, that thou miſtakes me concern- " ing *Ireland:* I deſire nothing more than a peace " there, *and never forbad thy commerce there.*" And I find the ſame intimated in a letter from the lord *Digby* to the lord *Jermin.* " We are, ſaith " he, advertis'd from *London*, that there are ſome " letters intercepted from the queen to the king, " with blanks to be ſigned by the king, autho- " rizing the queen to engage *Ireland* to the queen " regent for ſome aids." Now, though I grant thoſe things conclude nothing concerning the *Iriſh* rebellion; much leſs that king *Charles* was the author of it, yet they do prove what I mention them for, (*viz.*) that the queen, a bigoted papiſt, who bore an implacable hatred to the parliament of *England*, and their cauſe, was in the higheſt confidence with the king, intruſted in his councils, and employed any where ſhe could, to engage the

catholicks for his aſſiſtance: whence I think it not unreaſonable to ſuſpect, that ſhe might do the ſame in *Ireland* before, and be inſtrumental in exciting the rebellion there.

Fourthly, As it was complained of at that time, ſo ſeveral have thought, and do ſtill think that it look'd ſuſpicious, and that the kings miniſters did not conſult his honour and reputation in it, that the proclamation againſt the *Iriſh* rebels was ſo long deferred; and that only forty of them were allowed to be printed. The rebellion broke out in *October*: on the ſecond of *January*, the proclamation was ſent to the king's printer with this order: "It "is his majeſty's pleaſure that you forthwith print "in very good paper, and ſend unto me, for his "majeſty's ſervice, forty copies of the proclama-"tion encloſed, leaving convenient ſpace for his "majeſty to ſign above, and to fix the privy ſig-"net underneath: and his majeſty's command is, "*that you print not above the ſaid number of forty cop-*"*pies, and forbear to make any further publication of*"*them, till his pleaſure be further ſignified*; for "which this ſhall be your warrant, *E. N.*'

The king, I know, is ſaid to have offered in excuſe of this matter "that if no proclamation was "iſſu'd out ſooner (of which he was not certain) "it was becauſe the lords juſtices of *Ireland* de-"ſired them no ſooner: and whereas they deſired "but twenty, he ordered forty of them." But as theſe are circumſtances utterly unaccountable, I mean that in ſuch a ſtate of affairs, the lords juſtices ſhould deſire the proclamations againſt the rebels might be thus delayed; ſo they were altogether unknown at that time: the king was urged *ſpeedily* to proclaim them rebels, that an effectual courſe might

might be taken with them; urged to proceed ſeverely againſt villains, who reported they had authority from him to ſeize upon the holds of the *Engliſh* proteſtants; that they were the queen's ſoldiers, *&c.* and it is really ſtrange, conſidering their crimes, they ſhould be treated with ſo much tenderneſs and forbearance, not ſo much as proclaimed traitors for ſome months after the inſurrection!

Fifthly, Nor was the proclamation only delayed, but other means neceſſary for the ſervice of *Ireland*, and the relief of that diſtreſſed kingdom: how much the parliament was intent upon this is known, and what difficulties were thrown in their way is alſo known, whatever may be pretended to the contrary. I ſhall only mention one particular: after the fall of *Strafford*, *Sidney* earl of *Leiceſter* was appointed lord lieutenant of *Ireland*; the parliament was for haſtening him over all they could, affairs there requiring his preſence; but ſtill his departure was deferred from time to time: the earl apprehending he might be charged with the neglect of his duty, writes a letter to the earl of *Northumberland* to excuſe himſelf, and give the reaſons of his delay; an abſtract of which I ſhall here ſubjoin.

" Leaſt I ſhould now incur the cenſure of the " parliament for negligence in that ſervice, to which " I have been deſign'd, I will truly relate to your " lordſhip how I behav'd my ſelf; and if your " lordſhip pleaſe, you may communicate it to the " houſe of peers: I hope it will appear that, as I " have been very impatient of this delay, ſo I " have not wanted diligence in the ſollicitation " of my diſpatch: when I came to *York*, I told " the

" the king, I was come to receive his majeſty's
" commands, and inſtructions for that employ-
" ment, which he had done me the honour to
" confer upon me; and I did humbly beſeech
" him, I might not be ſtay'd at court, becauſe
" the parliament did deſire my ſpeedy repair into
" *Ireland*, and that his ſervice as I conceived, did
" require it; at leaſt that ſome governour, if I
" were not worthy of that charge ſhould be pre-
" ſently ſent into that kingdom. The king told
" me, that he would think of it; but I muſt
" confeſs I did not find his majeſty ſo ready to
" diſpatch me, as I hoped, and expected: from
" that time I did not fail to beſeech his majeſty
" to ſend me away, upon every opportunity I
" had of ſpeaking to him; divers times I made
" it my buſineſs to petition the king, that he
" would diſpatch me, or declare his intention that
" he would not let me go at all: the king ſaid
" my inſtructions ſhould be drawn, and that he would
" give order to Mr. ſecretary *Nichols* to do it, as
" ſpeedily as he could; in expectation whereof, I
" ſtayed about three weeks, till the king came
" from *York*; at which time his majeſty appoint-
" ed me to follow him to *Nottingham*; promiſing,
" that there I ſhould have my expeditions; I o-
" beyed his majeſty, and came after him to this
" town, where I have attended ever ſince, perpe-
" tually ſolliciting to be diſpatched, and beſeech-
" ing his majeſty, that I might either go to my
" employment, or have his leave to retire to mine
" own houſe; and that he would be pleaſed to
" let me know his reſolution, becauſe I conceiv-
" ed my ſelf to be under a heavy cenſure both of
" the parliament and of the whole kingdom, whilſt
" poſſibly they might think it my fault, that I
" was ſo long abſent from that charge I had un-
" dertaken;

" dertaken: 'tis to no purpoſe to tell you every
" paſſage, but this I proteſt to your lordſhip, that
" if it had been to ſave the lives of all my friends,
" and of my ſelf, I could not have done more to
" have procured my diſpatch: never the leſs I
" have not been able to advance it one ſtep, nor
" have I ſeen any thing to make me hope to have
" it quickly, till this morning Mr. Secretary *Ni-*
" *cholas* gave me a draught of my inſtructions to
" peruſe. With your lordſhip's leave I ſhall trou-
" ble you with another particular, wherein per-
" haps I ſuffer in the opinion of thoſe, who
" know not what has paſſed, though I be as in-
" nocent as a new born child; nay I have oppoſed it
" as much as I had power to do: the king be-
" ing being informed at *York* by ſome officious
" perſons, that certain draught horſes were provi-
" ded to be ſent into *Ireland*, his majeſty told
" me he muſt needs have them for his own uſe:
" I did humbly beſeech him not to take them
" away from his own ſervice in *Ireland*, for which
" they were bought. Beſides what I ſaid my
" ſelf, I uſed means by others to ſave the horſes;
" ſo that I heard never no more of it till I came
" hither; but then his majeſty told me he muſt
" needs have them, and preſſed me to ſend for
" them. I repreſented to his majeſty the inconſi-
" derableneſs of thoſe few horſes, and that the
" parliament might take it very ill, in regard
" the horſes bought with their money for the ſer-
" vice of the poor kingdom of *Ireland*, *&c.* Not-
" withſtanding all this, it pleaſed his majeſty to
" employ one *Errington*, who ſerved me, and gave
" him a warrant to fetch the horſes: *Errington*
" told me of it, and I forbad him, as far as I
" could, to do it; telling him that if he did, he
" he muſt not look to have any thing more to

" do

" do with me for ever, and that I made no doubt " the parliament would hang him for ſtealing " their horſes; and conceiving it to be an unjuſt " thing in it ſelf, diſpleaſing to the parliament, and " hurtful to the king's ſervice, I proteſted againſt " it. But *Errington* ſaid the king had command- " ed him, upon his allegiance, to execute the war- " rant." What inference Mr. *Wellwiſher* would make from ſuch a ſtory, was it for a cauſe he likes, is not difficult to gueſs: all the inference I ſhall make from it is, *that whoever raiſed the Iriſh rebellion, there was no great zeal expreſſed by ſome to ſuppreſs it*; and as the parliament and their adherents thought they had juſt cauſe to * complain of remiſſneſs

* The parliaments complaint on this head may be ſeen at large in their anſwer to the king's meſſage from *York*, *Auguſt* the 13th, 1642. The houſe of commons ſay, " They can not, " without a deep ſenſe of ſorrow, " call to mind, how popiſh and " prelatical counſels did ſo far prevail with his " majeſty, that two armies were brought within " the bowels of this kingdom, and two prote- " ſtant nations ready to welter in each other's " blood; that when both theſe armies had been " a long time defrayed at the charge of the " poor commons of *England*, and at length, by " God's bleſſing upon the endeavours of the par- " liament, quietly disbanded, the ſame wicked " Council (prevented of that deſign) did ſoon " after raiſe this bloody and barbarous rebelli- " on in *Ireland*; the ſuppreſſing whereof (for the " better colour) was recommeded to the care of " the parliament, who out of a fellow-feeling " of the unſpeakable miſeries of their proteſtant " bre-

* Vid. *Ruſhworth's* Collect. part 3. vol. 1. p. 775.

remiſſneſs in a matter, that called for the utmoſt application; ſo I can't think it any crime, if others at this day, upon a review of ſuch a conduct, entertain a ſuſpicion, that the king might have counſellors about him, not unfavourable to the *Iriſh* rebels.

Sixthly,

" brethren there (not ſuſpecting this horrid plot, " now too apparent) did chearfully undertake " that great work; but how they have been diſ- " couraged, retarded and diverted in and from this " pious and glorious work, by thoſe traitorous coun- " cils about his majeſty, will appear by many par- " ticulars, ſome whereof they ſhall upon this firſt " occaſion call to remembrance. That when the " lords and commons had, upon the firſt breaking " out of the rebellion, immediately provided and " ſent over 20000 pounds, and engaged themſelves " and the whole kingdom for the reducing of the " rebels, yet his majeſty after his return from " *Scotland* to *London*, was neither pleas'd, by word " or meſſage, to take notice of it, until after " ſome in the houſe of commons had truly ob- " ſerved, how forward thoſe miſchevous councils " were to incite his majeſty againſt his proteſtant " ſubjects of *Scotland*, and how ſlow to reſent " the proceedings of his papiſt traitors in *Ire-* " *land*.

" That although the rebels had moſt impu- " dently ſtiled themſelves the queen's army, and " profeſs the cauſe of their riſing was to main- " tain the king's prerogative, and the queen's " religion, againſt the puritan parliament in " *England*, and that thereupon both houſes of " parliament did humbly, and earneſtly adviſe " his majeſty to wipe away this ſcandal, by pro- " claiming them rebels and traitors to his maje-

Sixthly, It is known, that though the parliament of *England* were ſet upon proſecuting the war with the rebels, the king induſtriouſly ſought to make peace with them, and gave letters of authority

---

" ſty and the crown of *England*, which then " would have weakened the conſpirators in the " beginning, and encouraged both the parliament here, and good people there the more " vigorouſly to have oppoſed their proceedings; " yet ſuch was the power of theſe councils, that " no proclamation was ſet forth to that purpoſe, till almoſt three months after the breaking out of this rebellion; and then command given, that but forty ſhould be printed; " nor they publiſh'd till further directions ſhould " be given by his majeſty.

" That the parliament and adventurers had long " deſign'd five thouſand foot, and five hundred " horſe for the relief of *Munſter*, to be ſent as a " brigade, under the command of the lord *Warton*; " had made choice and liſted all the commanders, and prepared money, arms, and other proviſions for that expedition, and all to be at the " charge of the adventurers; and when nothing " was wanting but a commiſſion to the lord *Warton* to enable him for that ſervice, ſuch was the " power of thoſe councils, that no commiſſion " could be obtained from his majeſty; by reaſon " whereof *Limrick* was wholly loſt, and the province of *Munſter* is now in very great diſtreſs.

" That when divers pious, and well affected " perſons had prepared twelve ſhips, and ſix pinaces, with a thouſand or more land forces at " their own charge, by way of adventure for " the ſervice of *Ireland*, and deſired nothing but

" a com-

authority to *Glamorgan* to treat with them; a copy of which I ſhall here ſubjoin:

" CHARLES by the grace of God, king " of *England*, &c. To our truſty and " well-beloved couſin, earl of *Glamorgan*, greet- " ing: Being confident of your wiſdom and fi- delity;

" a commiſſion from his majeſty to enable them " thereunto, that commiſſion, after twice ſending " to *York* for the ſame, and the ſhips lying ready " to ſet ſail for three weeks together, at the charge " of near three hundred pound a day, was like- " wiſe denied; and thoſe adventurers (rather than " to looſe their expedition) were conſtrained to " go by virtue of an ordinance of both houſes " of parliament.

" That notwithſtanding the bleeding condition " of *Ireland*, yet divers commanders and officers " in pay, and in actual employment there againſt " the rebels, have been called away from that im- " portant ſervice, by the expreſs command of " his majeſty; as *Charles Lloyd* ingineer, and quar- " ter maſter general of the army in *Ireland*, and " divers others.

" That Captain *Green* comptroler of the artil- " lery, a man in pay, and principally employed, " and truſted here by the lord lieutenant of *Ire- " land*, for the providing and ordering the train " of artillery, which was to be ſent to *Dublin*, " and who had received great ſums of money for " that purpoſe, was commanded from that em- " ployment and truſt, to ſerve his majeſty in this " moſt unnatural war, againſt his loyal and beſt " affected people.

" That the parliament, having made great pro- " viſion of clothes for the poor ſouldiers in *Ire-*

" delity, we do by theſe letters, as if under
" our great ſeal, grant unto you full power, and
" authority to treat, and conclude with the con-
" federate *Roman* catholicks of *Ireland*, and to in-
" dulge to them all thoſe things which neceſſi-
" ty ſhall require, and which we cannot ſo com-
" modiouſly do by our lieutenant, nor our ſelves
" publickly own at preſent: therefore we com-
" mand, that you do this our buſineſs with as
" much ſecrecy as can be: whatſoever you think
" fit

" *land*, for their preſent ſuccour, and ſending ſix
" hundred ſuits, part thereof towards *Cheſter* the
" laſt week, the man that undertook the carriage
" of them, one *William Whitaker* by name, was
" ſtopped by his majeſty's cavaliers then lying
" about *Coventry*, who took away thoſe ſix hun-
" dred ſuits of clothes, and the waggon and hor-
" ſes of the poor man, altho' they were told, that
" the ſix hundred ſuits of cloths were for the
" ſoldiers in *Ireland*, and notwithſtanding the
" poor carrier was five times with the earl of
" *Northampton* to beg a releaſe of his waggon.

" That a great number of draught horſes, pre-
" pared by the parliament for the artillery, and
" baggage of the *Iriſh* army, were ſent to *Cheſter*
" for that purpoſe; and being there attending a
" paſſage, are now required by his majeſty, for
" his preſent ſervice in *England*.

" That his majeſty's forces are ſo quartered in
" and about the common roads to *Ireland*, that
" neither money, cloaths, victuals, or other pro-
" viſions can paſs thither by land, with any
" ſafety.

" That Captain *Kettleby* the admiral, and Sir
" *Henry Stradling* the vice admiral of the ſhips,
" which were directed to lie upon the coaſt of
" *Ireland*

" fit to promiſe in my name, that do I atteſt on " the word of a king, and a chriſtian, to grant " to thoſe confederate catholicks, who by their " aſſiſtance have abundantly ſhewed their zeal to " us, and our cauſe.

" Given at *Oxford* under our royal ſeal, the " twelfth of *March*, in the twentieth year " of our reign, 1644.

" *Ireland*, to annoy the rebels, and to prevent " the bringing to them ammunition and relief " from foreign parts, are both called away from " that employment, by his majeſty's command: " and by reaſon of their departure from the coaſt " of *Munſter*, to which they were deſigned, the " rebels there have received powder, ammuniti- " on and relief from foreign parts; by which, and " many other particulars, too long to relate, it " may ſeem, as if thoſe barbarous *Iriſh* rebels are " kept on foot, and countenanced there, of de- " ſign to aſſiſt the *Northern* cavaliers, and accord- " ing to the earl of *Straford*'s unheard-of advice, " *to have an army in* Ireland, *with which his ma- " jeſty may reduce this kingdom:* eſpecially conſi- " dering thoſe confident rebels have preſumed " very lately to ſend a petition to his majeſty, " intitling themſelves his majeſty's catholick ſub- " jects of *Ireland*, and complaining of the *puri- " tan* parliament of *England*; and deſiring that " ſince his majeſty comes not thither, according " to their expectation, that they may come into " *England* to his majeſty: which petition we " may juſtly fear is but a prologue to that tra- " gedy, they have deſign'd to act here, in caſe " their coming over be not prevented by the " care and vigilancy of the parliament, and good " people of *England*."

Accordingly

Accordingly a treaty was actually concluded with them by the earl, in the king's name, (*Auguſt* the 25th 1645.) in which it is granted to them to enjoy the free, and publick exerciſe of the *Roman* catholick religion, and of the reſpective functions thereof; to enjoy all and every the churches by them enjoyed within the kingdom, or by them poſſeſſed at any time ſince the twenty third of *October*, 1641: that they ſhall be exempted from the juriſdiction of the proteſtant clergy, and that the *Roman* catholick clergy ſhall not be moleſted, for the exerciſe of their juriſdiction over their reſpective catholick flocks, in matters ſpiritual and eccleſiaſtical. It was further granted them, and agreed by the ſaid earl, that an act ſhould be paſſed in the next parliament, for confirming to them the liberty of their religion, *&c.* and that from the firſt day of the ſeſſions of that parliament, his majeſty's *Roman* catholick ſubjects in *Ireland* ſhall be adjudged capable of all offices of truſt and advancements, places, degrees, dignities, *&c.* any acts, ſtatutes, uſage, or law to the contrary notwithſtanding. And as friendſhip was thus concluded with them, they were afterwards uſed as friends and confidents: accordingly the earl of *Antrim* is treated with, who engaged to join *Montroſs* in *Scotland* with ten thouſand *Iriſh*, and in purſuit of his promiſe ſent part of that number: and the like aſſiſtance was expected from them in *England*. Thus the king writes to *Ormond*.

" I muſt again remember you to preſs the *Iriſh*, " for their ſpeedy aſſiſtance to me here, and their " friends in *Scotland*: I deſire that the *Iriſh* will " ſend as great a body, as they can land about " *Cumberland*, which will put theſe northern coun- " ties into a brave condition."

Seventhly,

Seventhly, Several circumſtances relating to the rebellion, both before it broke out, and afterwards, have increaſed the ſuſpicion, and for ought I ſee juſtly, that ſome in great power in the *Engliſh* court gave countenance to it: I won't bring into the argument the commiſſion the rebels produced, with the king's broad ſeal to it; this will not be allowed of any authority; but the oath they took ſeems to intimate, that their enmity was not levelled againſt the king: I will recite a part of it.

"I *A. B.* do in the preſence of almighty "God, and all the angels, and ſaints in "heaven, promiſe, vow, ſwear, and proteſt, that "I will bear faith, and allegiance to our ſovereign "lord king *Charles*, his heirs and ſucceſſors, and "that I will defend him, and them as far as I may "with my life, power and eſtate, againſt all ſuch "perſons, as ſhall attempt any thing againſt their "royal perſons, honours and eſtates or dignities, "and againſt all ſuch as ſhall directly or indirectly, endeavour to ſuppreſs their royal prerogatives, "or do any act, or acts contrary to regal government, *&c.*

This oath the confederate *roman* catholicks took, before they entered upon their work; how far it implies an underſtanding between them and the loyal party, as they were called, I ſhan't ſay; but, methinks, it agrees well enough, not only with the ſtrain of the commiſſion, but with what they openly avowed, *viz.* to defend the king's prerogative againſt the parliament and puritans of *England*. The report of a committee of *Iriſh* papiſts meeting at *White-hall*, and often in conſultation there, the ſummer before the rebellion, who were afterwards at the head of it, could not but give umbrage:

I men-

I mentioned before, how long the proclamation againſt tham was delayed, after they had begun their violence, and inhumanly murdered a multitude of proteſtants; what gentleneſs and forbearance was uſed towards them, and with what kindneſs, and even friendſhip they were treated in the peace concluded with them: and I find ſomething of the ſame temper in the parliament of *Ireland* at that time: * Mr. *Ruſhworth* tells us, that when the houſes met, and came to treat of the inſurrection, they covered it with ſuch a vail, and treated of it ſo nicely, and with that tenderneſs, as gave reaſon to ſuſpect, they were themſelves tainted with the ſame infection; inſiſting that they might not be called *traitors nor rebels;* for they ſaid ſuch terms would too much exaſperate them; and the appellation of diſcontented gentlemen was the worſt that could be wrung from them; till one gentleman, heartily deteſting the fig-leaves thrown over this nakedneſs, told the ſpeaker, *&c.* The ſtory of the *Marquis* of *Antrim* I here paſs over, as being diſputed; and ſhall afterwards conſider it.

Now, though I do not pretend, that all this amounts to a direct, and full proof that king *Charles*, or any others that might abuſe his name and authority, were acceſſary to the *Iriſh* rebellion, yet I think it will juſtify a ſuſpicion, and vindicate thoſe that entertain it, and upon occaſion repeat theſe hiſtorical facts, from the charge of ſlander, malice, *&c.* For my ſelf, I can profeſs with great ſincerity, that I take no pleaſure in reviving the memory of ſuch things; nor ſhould I have mentioned them in the *Memorial*, but to do juſtice to the ſubject

* Collect *part* 3. vol. 1. *p.* 412.

I was

I was upon: and I ſtill ſay, as I then did, that I had rather they were falſe than true; but as I apprehend there is juſt cauſe for ſuſpicion, and I have carried the matter no farther, I can't think it any crime to ſay ſo, nor any fault in an hiſtorian, to relate facts as they appear to him: I could eaſily prove, Mr. *Wellwiſher* has affirmed a great many things, upon far leſs evidence, and accuſed men and parties, with great poſitiveneſs, upon leſs grounds; but I ſhall leave the cauſe to the reader's judgment, and candour; and proceed to conſider, what the author I am now concern'd with (Mr. *Carte*) has alledged on the other ſide (*viz.*) in vindication of king *Charles*, and to prove that he was not, and could not be acceſſary to the *Iriſh* rebellion, and that the ſuſpicion of it muſt be unreaſonable.

What he has ſaid may be reduced to the following heads. *Firſt*, That the rebels themſelves cleared the king, particularly Sir *Phelim O Neal*, concerning whom Dr. *Ker*, dean of *Ardagh* depoſed, that he declared, " he could not in conſcience charge " the king with the inſurrection, though he had " been frequently ſollicited thereto by fair promiſes, " and great rewards, while he was in priſon; and " that the commiſſion, which he formerly pretend- " ed to have had from the king, was drawn up " by his own order, and the broad ſeal affixt to " it was taken from a patent of the lord *Caul-* " *field's*, found in the caſtle of *Charlemount*:" (and this I find is the chief argument of Mr. *Carte*; on which he ſeems to lay the greateſt ſtreſs in his defence) " you may ſee him, ſaith he, (referring to " good Sir *Phelim*) under all the terrors of death, " and the ſtrongeſt temptations man could lye un- " der, bravely atteſting that prince's innocency, and

" ſealing the truth of his teſtimony with his " blood: read the whole, and then conſider " whether any thing can more clearly diſprove " that (as far as I have heard) only pretence of " the charge againſt the king, or ſhew at once " more evidently the conſummate wickedneſs of that " party, which accuſed him of ſo horrid a crime, " and their inability to make good their charge;" and after citing another paragraph, much to the ſame purpoſe *p.* 10. he concludes triumphantly, " can the moſt prejudiced perſons read this, with- " out being convinced, as well of that good " prince's perfect innocence, as of the exquiſite " malice of his enemies." And ſo full is he of this argument, that he returns to it again and a-gain, and employs a great many pages in it, as *p.* 4, 5, 7, 9, 10, 16, 17, 18, *&c.* In anſwer to it I have a few things to offer.

1. That their known doctrine of equivoca-ting, and mental reſervation is ſufficient to deſtroy the credit of their teſtimony, and ſpoil the argu-ment built upon it: I need not ſtand to prove that they allow, and plead for the lawfulneſs of lying upon occaſion: as they maintain, that faith is not to be kept with hereticks, ſo they don't think themſelves under the obligation of common juſtice to perſons of that character: even perjury, lying, and murder may not only be diſpenſed with, but, in ſome caſes, are accounted meritorious; as when they are judged ſerviceable to the catholick cauſe, and againſt hereticks: this gentleman, I am per-ſuaded, can hardly queſtion whether there have been inſtances of papiſts going out of the world, with lyes in their mouths; ſolemnly denying facts, of which there have not wanted the fulleſt evidence: their divinity teaches them there's no guilt in ſuch things; the diſpenſing power of their popes, and the

the good end they have in ſuch actions, takes our all the malignity and evil of them: ſo that if it can be ſuppoſed, in the preſent inſtance; theſe perſons might be made to believe the clearing of king *Charles* would be for their intereſt, the future intereſt of their cauſe and church, either as an aſſiſtance to the king in his affairs againſt his proteſtant ſubjects, or on any other account, I know no principles they have, that would, in ſuch circumſtances, reſtrain them from denying the fact, tho' they knew it to be true: and, methinks, theſe gentleman are not a little partial, who at every turn repreſent another ſort of men, the *fanaticks* I mean, as deſerving no credit; as reporting, affirming, denying any thing to ſerve their cauſe, though they profeſs not any principles conſiſtent with ſuch vileneſs, but own an indiſpenſible obligation always to ſpeak the truth in their hearts, and yet can yield ſo eaſy, and full a belief to the teſtimony of papiſts, who account lying ſometimes no ſin.

Secondly, I find this gentleman makes his catholick vouchers, not only diſclaim, a commiſſion from the king, but acknowledge their inſurrection to be rebellion, *p.* 7. which is contrary to their avowed principles: proteſtant princes are hereticks with them, ſtand excommunicated; and it is their current doctrine, that to take up arms againſt ſuch, is no rebellion: ſo that here the teſtimony is carried too far, and prejudices its own authority: the author infers it could not be rebellion, if they had the king's commiſſion to warrant them; I infer they could not acknowledge it, according to their principles, to be rebellion, though they had not the king's commiſſion; or if they did, that there's no conſcience in the acknowledgment.

Thirdly, Granting it true, that they cleared the king, and that their teſtimony is authentick, it doth not fully reach the point in hand: it only proves that the king did not *himſelf* give them a commiſſion; but doth not prove that none in his name, and acting by his authority did it; or at leaſt might excite them to, and encourage them in their rebellion; which is the only thing I am ſuppoſing: this gentleman has mentioned Dr. *Maxwel*'s depoſitions, in which there is a paſſage, that, ſome may think, looks ſuſpicious (and which he thought proper to omit) the Dr. asked the rebels, why they ſometimes pretended a commiſſion from the king, and at othertimes from the queen; ſince all wiſe men know that the king would not grant a commiſſion againſt himſelf, and that the queen could not; they anſwer, (after the paſſage mentioned by Mr. *Carte*) "that they thought it lawful to "pretend what they could in advancement of their "cauſe, *&c.*" that for the queen, in regard as a catholick, "ſhe had enemies enow already, they "would command their prieſts, publickly, at maſs "to diſcharge the people from ſpeaking of her, *as* "*a cauſe or abettor of the preſent troubles;*" ſo that we ſtill want the teſtimony, even of theſe men, in a very material point: whatever they ſay of the king, they don't ſeem to clear the queen; only enjoin that ſhe ſhould not be mentioned as a cauſe, or abettor of the preſent troubles.

2. That the king has cleared himſelf of it, denying it in the moſt ſolemn manner, appealing to heaven, *&c.* as in his Εἰκων βασιλικὴ: this is another argument our author produces in the king's vindication: and for my part I am not diſpoſed to call in queſtion his majeſty's veracity; but, methinks, this gentleman, and every one elſe muſt allow, it

can't

can't, of it ſelf, be of ſufficient weight; thoſe that ſuſpect the king guilty of the fact, won't wonder at his denying it, nor leſs believe it purely on that account; ſhould *Cromwel* never ſo ſolemnly have denied his contract with the devil, I queſtion whether Mr. *Carte* would have taken his word: and though I am not for making compariſons between the perſons, yet 'tis certain every body doth not agree with our author, and ſuch like advocates for king *Charles*, in the high opinion they have of his veracity, and other virtues; 'tis ſufficiently known to every body, that has read the affairs of that time, that the parliament often complained of the king's falſifying his word, that they could not truſt him, and that he pretended one thing in his meſſages, and treaties with them, whilſt he was endeavouring and acting quite the contrary: and when the letters, that paſſed between him and the queen were diſcovered, they thought they had abundant evidence of this: ſome have remembred, that in a printed declaration from *Newark* (dated *March 9th*, 1641.) he diſowned all correſpondence abroad for engaging foreign aids. "We "are confident, ſaith he, no ſober honeſt Man in "our kingdom can believe, that we are ſo deſpe-"rate, or ſo ſenſeleſs as to entertain ſuch deſigns, as "would bury our name, and poſterity in perpe-"tual ſcorn and infamy." And yet at the very ſame time the queen was ſolliciting for ſuccour from *Lorrain*, and Colonel * *Cockran* appointed to treat with the king of *Denmark* for arms, and men, to be ſent over from thence into *England*: nor is it very conſiſtent with the conſummate, and almoſt angelic virtues ſome aſcribe to this prince,

* *Ludlow's* Memoirs *part* 3. *p.* 315.

particular;

particulars with what Mr. *Carte* ſaith of him, " that his integrity was too bright to be tarniſh-" ed with the baſe ſuſpicion of his enemies, that " treachery never made any part of his character, " never appear'd in any one action of his;" it doth not well comport with this, that he clapt up a peace ſecretly with the *Iriſh*, after he had engaged himſelf to the contrary, and had ſigned an act of parliament, (1641) in which was this clauſe; " That the war againſt the bloody *Iriſh* ſhould " proceed, till it was declared by parliament, that " *Ireland* was fully ſubdued; and that no peace, " nor any ceſſation of arms ſhould be made with " thoſe rebels, without the conſent of both houſes " of parliament." And in like manner, he promiſed the parliament, he would never abrogate the laws againſt the papiſts: what he ſaid to the queen on this ſubject, and what he engaged in the treaty with the *Iriſh* is known, and has been mentioned before: but I ſhan't enlarge on a ſubject ſo ungrateful to my ſelf, and offenſive to others: I'll here ſuppoſe the king was ſincere in his appeals to heaven in this matter; but then I muſt obſerve that, even upon this conceſſion, that the king is to be believed in what he ſaith, our author has by no means gained his point: the king clears himſelf, it's true, but his denial neither clears the queen, nor any others; who, notwithſtanding all theſe ſolemn proteſtations, might have correſpondence with the *Iriſh*, and be abettors of the rebellion.

3. The author alledges ſeveral reaſons againſt it, *p.* 18. and tells us, that the king's granting a commiſſion " or authority in the caſe be-" fore us, to any perſon whatſoever is contrary, " *Firſt*, To the publick authentick acts of the " king himſelf, and of the lords juſtices; to the " proclamations

" proclamations againſt them, *October* the 30th, " *January* the 1ſt, *&c.* Acts of ſuch a nature, " as to vacate all commiſſions inconſiſtent with " them." But this has nothing in it to his purpoſe: at this rate one might undertake to prove, that *Ahaſuerus* did not grant *Haman* a commiſſion to deſtroy the *Jews*, becauſe he afterwards gave a counter commiſſion. Whatever ſecret encouragement the king had given the rebels, it might be thought neceſſary afterwards to ſend out a proclamation againſt them: we have an inſtance of ſomewhat the like conduct, in another caſe not long after. I mentioned before that *Glamorgan*, by the king's authority, had ſecretly concluded a peace with the *Iriſh*; which, when it came to be divulged, occaſioned great complaints among the proteſtants: upon this * *Digby* and *Ormond* conſult what is to be done, and reſolve at laſt, that *Digby* ſhould accuſe *Glamorgan* of high treaſon; which was accordingly done, and he ſent to priſon: this piece of management appeaſed the murmuring diſcontented proteſtants; and that the *catholicks* (from whom they expected 3000 men to go over to the relief of *Cheſter*) might not be incenſed at the injury done *Glamorgan*, *Ormond* in a letter to *Muskerry*, one of the principal rebels, acquaints them with the reaſons of the action: ſo that here was one accuſed of treaſon, impriſoned by the king's miniſters and confidents, for doing what the king had authorized him to do. He adds, it's contrary, *Secondly*, To the king's ſurprize at the breaking out of the rebellion. *Thirdly*, To his profeſſion of ſorrow, for the bleeding condition of the kingdom of

* Breviary of the Hiſt. of parliament wrote in *Latin* by *T. M. p.* 131.

Ireland. Fourthly, To his repeated ſolemn appeals to God. But there is ſo little appearance of argument in all this, conſidering what has been ſaid, that this gentleman will, I preſume, excuſe me, if I ſay nothing to it: indeed ſuch reaſons are fit to be offered only to thoſe, that are prepared to believe every thing in favour of king *Charles*, and nothing againſt him. *Fifthly*, To his whole conduct and actions, to his zealous endeavours that timely relief might be ſent over to the ſuccour of the diſtreſſed proteſtants, *&c.* But this, I am afraid is only the language of a warm zeal, and won't make much impreſſion on thoſe, that have ſeen the earl of *Leiceſter*'s letters mentioned before; that have heard and read of the complaints of the parliament, and the nation, that the king often obſtructed endeavours to ſuccour *Ireland*, ſometimes intercepted the ſuccour deſigned for them, was moſt intent upon putting a ſtop to the war againſt them, and upon making a peace with them. I need not give more inſtances of this; I ſhall only ſubjoin one: while the *Uxbridge* treaty was depending, the king writes to the *Marquis* of *Ormond*, and tells him, "The rebels here have agreed to "treat, and aſſuredly one of the firſt and chief ar-"ticles they will inſiſt on, will be to continue "the *Iriſh* war, which is a point not popular "for me to break on; of which you are to make "a double uſe; to haſten with all diligence the "peace there, *&c.*" I don't know how far our author may have his reaſon and faith under command, and in ſubjection to his inclination, as he tells us ſome people have, *p.* 22. but for my ſelf, I muſt own, I can't ſo far get maſtery of my reaſon and faith, as to believe king *Charles* zealous againſt the *Iriſh* papiſts: He adds, (after repeating the ſtrong argument, we had ſeveral times before, the king's

king's own word, he was not guilty) " 'tis con-
" trary to this conſideration likewiſe, which alone
" (ſaith Sir *R. Cox*) muſt convince all mankind
" of the king's innocence in this affair, and that
" is, that an *Iriſh* rebellion was the moſt un-
" lucky, and fatal thing that could happen to his
" majeſty at that time: it broke all his meaſures,
" and was ſo evidently againſt his intereſt, that no
" body could ſuſpect him to contrive it, that doth
" not, at the ſame time, think he was mad:"
which muſt be underſtood thus, that the king fore-
ſaw the conſequences of the rebellion, and was
convinced before-hand, it would be unlucky and
fatal to him; otherwiſe 'tis a very poor reaſon for
a knight to offer, eſpecially with ſuch aſſurance,
that it muſt convince all the world. I verily think
it can't convince any one man in the world, ex-
cept he was prejudiced in the cauſe, and who
was not convinced before, or would not be con-
vinced without it.

Our author concludes, " theſe are ſuch contra-
" dictions, as I hope there are very few of ſo keen,
" and unreaſonable a malice towards king *Charles*,
" as to ſwallow them for the gratifying it." But
what if theſe contradictions are but imaginary, and
of his own making? his triumph is then ſpoil'd:
and whether they be or not, the reader may judge
from what has been ſaid. King *Charles* declares he
was not acceſſary to the *Iriſh* rebellion; *ergo*, 'tis
a contradiction to ſuppoſe he was: he put out de-
clarations againſt the rebels; *ergo*, 'tis a contradicti-
on to ſuppoſe he gave them a commiſſion, or
was acceſſary, *&c.* it proved fatal to his affairs;
ergo, 'tis a coutradiction to ſuppoſe he contrived,
or abbetted it: what logick this gentleman is ac-
quainted with, that can make ſuch propoſitions con-

tradictory I know not: I am ſure I can ſee no contradictions in them, and muſt take the liberty to ſay, that I apprehend the matter in debate to ſtand as it was, and that Mr. *Carte* has offered nothing ſufficient to remove the ſuſpicion: contradictions, I muſt confeſs, are very ill things to ſwallow, eſpecially when malice is the vehicle: but as there is no contradiction in this caſe, ſo could a man diſpenſe with ſo bad a thing as malice, he has no need of it here: that king *Charles*, or others acting in his name, were acceſſary to the *Iriſh* rebellion, is a propoſition any one may believe, without unreaſonable malice againſt the king: nor doth any thing this gentleman has advanced, prove it implies a contradiction. But I ſhall carry on this debate no farther: I have repreſented the reaſons of ſuſpicion on one ſide, and have conſidered what Mr. *Carte* has ſaid on the other, and ſhall leave the whole to the judgment of the reader, and proceed to the ſtory of the *Marquis* of *Antrim*, about which this gentleman employs the remaining part of his pamphlet.

The matter is thus related by Mr. *Baxter* in his life, *part* 3*d*, *p.* 82. " The duke of *Ormond*, " and the council had the cauſe of the *Marquis* " of *Antrim* before them, who had been one of " the *Iriſh* rebels, in the beginning of the war: " his eſtate being ſequeſtered, he ſought the reſti- " tution of it, when king *Charles* the *ſecond* was " reſtored: *Ormond* and the council judged againſt " him, as one of the rebels: he brought his cauſe " over to the king, and affirmed, that what he " did was by his father's conſent, and authority: " the king refer'd it to ſome very worthy mem- " bers of his privy council, to examine what he " had to ſhew; upon examination they reported,

" he

" he had the king's conſent, and letters of in-
" ſtruction for what he did, which amazed many.
" Hereupon his majeſty, *Charles* the *ſecond* wrote
" to the duke of *Ormond*, and the council to reſtore
" his eſtate, becauſe it appeared to thoſe appointed
" to examine it, that what he did was by his fa-
" ther's order or conſent: but it ſtopt not here;
" for the lord *Mazarine*, and others of *Ireland*
" did ſo far proſecute the cauſe, as that the *Mar-*
" *quiſs* of *Antrim* was forced to produce in the
" parliament of *England*, in the houſe of commons,
" a letter of the king (*Charles* the *firſt*) by which he
" gave him orders for taking up arms; which being
" read in the houſe put them into a ſilence." This is the ſtory, on which this great man inſults over Mr. *Baxter* with ſo much decency and manners: had he repreſented him as miſtaken, and with meekneſs and candour have gone along to detect the miſtake, there had been no cauſe of complaint; but he will needs have him guilty of willful perverſion, out of baſe and vile deſigns; and indeed inſinuates, as if he had forged part of the ſtory, or taken it up without grounds: what he has offered to diſprove it, in a tedious confuſed immethodical harangue, I ſhall conſider: the ſubſtance of what he ſaith, may be reduced to three heads.

Firſt, he makes it a queſtion whether any ſuch letter, as Mr. *Baxter* mentioned, was read in the parliament houſe; " that he (*Mazarine*) ſhould
" petition the parliament of *England*, and bring the
" cauſe before the houſe of commons here, is a
" point that may well be queſtioned;" with more to the ſame purpoſe; *p.* 36, 37. but with me Mr. *Baxter*'s authority is ſufficient to put it out of queſtion: one can't reaſonably ſuppoſe him ignorant, whether it was fact or not; he lived in the very

time; had opportunity of informing himſelf about it; was a perſon of good intelligence, well acquainted with publick occurrences; and he tells us poſitively, that a letter of king *Charles*'s was read in the parliament houſe: now, if it was not ſo, the conſequence will be, not only that Mr. *Baxter* was a knave (as this gentleman inſinuates, thus to abuſe the world with a falſe and malicious ſtory) but that he was a *fool* alſo: the thing was not done in a corner, in a phanatical conventicle, but openly tranſacted in the parliament of *England*, as Mr. *Baxter* affirms: and occaſioned a great deal of ſpeculation without doors; many reflections on the king, *&c.* and who in his wits, would expoſe himſelf to cenſure and contempt, by telling a ſtory, that thouſands have been able to contradict, had it not been true? ſo that whatever this gentleman doth, I can't allow my ſelf to queſtion but that *Mazarine* appealed to the parliament, and that what Mr. *Baxter* ſaith of a letter read there is fact.

Secondly, He attempts to prove that the M. of *Antrim* was not concerned in the rebellion at all; was never engaged with the rebels, and that all the correſpondence he had with them was afterwards, and in order to draw forces to join *Montroſs* in *Scotland*, *&c.* This is what he aſſerts, and thinks it a full proof againſt his adverſaries: thus *p.* 37. ſpeaking of the letter, (pretended to be read in parliament) wanting date; " This, ſays he, looks " very ſuſpicious; but what more directly proves " the falſhood of the letter, or the repreſentation " made of it, is that 'tis quoted for juſtifying a " man for doing what he never did, and for gi- " ving the Marquis a commiſſion to take up arms " in the *Iriſh* rebellion, which the *Marquis* him-

" ſelf

" ſelf knew nothing of." And it can't be denied if he can make this good, but the very foundation of the controverſy is deſtroyed; and either Mr. *Baxter* feigned the ſtory he tells about king *Charles*'s letter, or the letter muſt be wrote for another purpoſe than Mr. *Baxter* imagines. In anſwer to this pretence I ſhall offer two things. *Firſt*, That it is affirmed by hiſtorians of thoſe times, that the *Marquis* was concerned in the rebellion; Mr. *Baxter* ſaith " he had been one of the *Iriſh* rebels " in the beginning of that war: *Ludlow* * ſaith, " he was principally concerned in the rebellion, " and that he was concerned among the firſt in the " rebellion;" and if theſe authorities ſhould be deſpiſed (for I conſider with whom I have to do) I hope that of the lord *Clarendon* will have ſome weight; and he tells † us, " that the earl of *Antrim*, who " was a man of exceſſive pride and vanity, and of " a very weak and narrow underſtanding, was no " ſooner without the council of his wife (who re- " tired to *England* upon the breaking out of the " rebellion) but he betook himſelf to the rebels, " with an imagination, that his quality and fortune " would give him the ſupreme power over them: " the rebels were glad of his preſence, and to have " his name known to be among them, but had no " confidence in his abilities to adviſe, or command " them; but relied much more upon his brother " *Alexander Macdonnel*, who was faſt to their " party, and in their moſt ſecret councels: the " earl, according to his natural unſteadineſs, did not " like his ſtation there, but by diſguiſe got him " ſelf into the proteſtant army, and from thence

---

* *Mem. p.* 3. *p.* 41. 115.

† Hiſt. of the Rebellion vol. 2d, *part* 2d, *p.* 607. 8vo

" into

" into *England.*" He is poſitive that he was among the rebels, and joined with them *at firſt*: how long he remained with them he doth not tell us: he adds, (*p.* 609.) " that though he had pow-
" er among the *Roman* catholicks, he was very odi-
" ous to the proteſtants, and obnoxious to the
" ſtate at *Dublin*, many things being diſcourſed
" againſt him of his correſpondence with the rebels,
" which were not known when he came into *Eng-*
" *land*:" ſo that here's a full teſtimony from an hiſtorian, whoſe credit this gentleman will not, I preſume, queſtion, againſt what he ſuppoſes and confidently aſſerts, (*viz.*) *that the* Marquis *was not concerned in the rebellion:* if we may believe my lord *Clarendon* he had been among them, and had behav'd himſelf ſo, as to render him odious to the proteſtants; in ſo much that when he pretended to have left the rebels, and was offering to ſerve the king another way, it ſeems his former conduct was an objection againſt employing him. *Secondly,* The whole proceſs againſt him afterwards ſuppoſes he had been in the rebellion. I would ask this gentleman or any other, how his eſtate came to be ſequeſtered; why the duke of *Ormond*, and council judg'd againſt him: it won't be ſaid ſure that the charge againſt him was the after ſervice he undertook for the king, joining *Montroſs*, *&c.* that was no crime, and could not bring him under puniſhment: conſequently ſince he was treated as a rebel, and deprived of his eſtate as ſuch, it is a full argument that he was looked upon as a rebel: a certain writer, I might call him ingenious, learned, *&c.* after the example of Mr. *Wellwiſher*, tells us that theſe eight articles were proved againſt the *Marquis*, and afterwards tranſmitted by the privy council of *Ireland* to king *Charles* the ſecond. *Firſt,* That he was to have had an hand in ſurprizing the caſtle of *Dub-*

lin,

lin, 1641. *Secondly*, That he was of the rebels party, which was made appear by his frequent intercourſe with *Renny Omore*, and many others. *Thirdly*, That he entered into the Roman catholick confederacy before the year 1643. *Fourthly*, That he conſtantly adhered to the *Nuncio*'s party. *Fifthly*, That he ſat from time to time in the ſupreme council of *Kilkenny*. *Sixthly*, That he ſigned the execrable oath of aſſociation. *Seventhly*, That he was commiſſionated, and acted as lieutenant general from the ſaid aſſembly of *Kilkenny*. *Eighthly*, That he declared himſelf, by ſeveral letters of his own penning, to have been in conjunction with *Owen Ro O Neal*, a conſtant oppoſer to the ſeveral peaces made by the lord lieutenant with the *Iriſh*: theſe articles ſhow of what he was accuſed; and indeed had we not known the particulars, it would have been a natural inference from their proceedings againſt him, that his crime was different from what Mr. *Carte* fancies.

But as this is the gentleman's chief argument, by which he endeavours to overthrow Mr. *Baxter*'s ſtory and credit, he ſuggeſts ſeveral things for the ſupport of it (*viz.* to prove that the *Marquis* was not one of the rebels) which I muſt not paſs over: as, *Firſt*, That the court of claims in *Ireland*, on hearing the cauſe, judged him innocent, *p.* 24. I anſwer, they could not judge he had never been in the rebellion, for it it has been proved he was: beſide however they judged, it is plain others judged againſt him; otherwiſe there had been no occaſion to bring that matter before the king, and for the king to write in his favour, as this gentleman knows he did, and owns he did. *Secondly*, He thinks it looks well in the *Marquis*'s behalf, that he is not mentioned in any of the liſts of the rebels,

rebels, (*p.* 24.) but ſuppoſing this to be true, it may be accounted for, by what the lord *Clarendon* tells us, mentioned before; that when he found his pride and vanity not gratified among them, he left them; which might be the occaſion of his being left out of the liſts taken afterwards: but the ſame hiſtorian affirms he was with them, and had rendered himſelf ſo obnoxious, and hateful to the proteſtants, that when the king had a mind to employ him in his ſervice againſt the *Scots*, this circumſtance was a diſcouragement to him. *vid. Clar. Vol. 2d, pt 2. p. 607. Thirdly*, he farther alledges as an evidence that the *Marquis* had no hand in the rebellion, *viz.* That the rebels complained of him for not taking up arms; that he condemned their cruelty, and foretold God's wrath, and the king's revenge upon them, *p.* 25. where he harangues upon the ſubject, and concludes " What " hand could the *Marquis* have in that maſſacre, " which he ſo abhor'd, and was ſo free in expreſ- " ſing his abhorrence of?" now ſuppoſing all this fact, and whether it be or not I ſhall not enquire, its far from proving what it's brought for: I have ſhown that he was in the rebellion, that he deſerted his friends upon diſguſt (not becauſe they were too cruel, but becauſe he was too proud, as *Clarendon* informs us) and came over into *England*; the doing which (with ſuch circumſtances as might attend the thing) might draw forth all the reſentment here mentioned: and thus I preſume the force of this gentleman's argument is broken; and any man that ſaw reaſon to believe before, may ſtill believe the *Marquis* of *Antrim* was in the *Iriſh rebellion*, notwithſtanding what Mr. *Carte* has ſuggeſted to the contrary.

Thirdly,

Thirdly, Another thing he inſiſts upon, and which he triumphs in, as containing full evidence in favour of his cauſe, is the king's letter concerning the *Marquis:* Mr. *Baxter*, perverting the letter, argues from it, that the *Marquis* of *Antrim* was in the rebellion, and had king *Charles* the *firſt*'s warrant for what he did. Mr. *Carte*, on the other hand, proves from this letter, that the *Marquis* was not in the rebellion, and that all the inſtructions and commiſſion he had from the king, reſpect after ſervices, as in *Scotland*, *&c.* concerning which let me obſerve; *Firſt*, This gentleman confounds the two letters: (of king *Charles* the *firſt*, and *ſecond*) after reciting the report of the members of council, he ſaith, " This is the paſſage in the letter, " which Mr. *Baxter* grounds his charge againſt " king *Charles* the *firſt* upon: " whereas 'tis the other letter of king *Charles* the *firſt*, read in the houſe of commons, that Mr. *Baxter chiefly* grounds upon: he mentions, it's true, king *Charles* the *ſecond*'s letter; but this gentleman knows, or may know, he lays the main ſtreſs upon the other letter. Whether our author deſignedly paſſes by the letter of king *Charles* the *firſt*, as not knowing what to ſay to it, and inſiſts on the other, as being what he can, with more eaſe, make ſpeak to his purpoſe, I ſhall not determine; but we find him generally arraigning Mr. *Baxter*, on the ſubject of king *Charles* the *ſecond* his letter. *Secondly*, I obſerve that king *Charles* the *firſt*'s letter cannot be ſuppoſed to refer to a commiſſion, to raiſe forces for *Scotland*, and ſervices of that kind; for beſides that the *Marquis* was not accuſed on that account, and conſequently the producing ſuch a letter had no tendency to vindicate him, and could be nothing to his purpoſe; beſides this, a letter of

ſuch a nature would not have occaſioned ſo great amazement, and produced a general ſilence in the houſe: this the gentleman, it may be, was aware of, and therefore thinks it beſt to deny the fact, and, in his great modeſty, call the ſtory "one of thoſe "lies, the faction (whoſe rebellion ſubverted the "conſtitution, and to whoſe malice the king him-"ſelf fell a ſacrifice) have never ſcrupled to raiſe, "and to aſſert with confidence, when ever they "thereby could ſerve the intereſt of their cauſe; "a cauſe indeed that needed them, and could not "be ſupported otherwiſe" *p.* 36. *Thirdly*, As to the letter of king *Charles* the *ſecond*, which this gentleman diſcants upon, and for perverting which he ſo ſeverely rebukes Mr. *Baxter*, I don't ſee that this is to his purpoſe: it neither clears the *Marquis* of the rebellion, nor the king for giving him a commiſſion for what he did in it. I own the king ſaith, "that the referees had ſeen ſeveral let-"ters, all of them of the hand writing of his "royal father, and ſeveral inſtructions *concerning* "*his treating and joining with the* Iriſh, *in order to* "*the king's ſervice, by reducing them to their obedi-*"*ence, and by drawing ſome forces from them,* "*for the ſervice of* Scotland." But he adds, "be-"ſides the letters and orders under his majeſty's "hand, they have received ſufficient evidence, "and teſtimony of ſeveral *private meſſages*, and di-"rections from our royal father, and royal mo-"ther, with the privity and direction of the "king our father, by which they are perſuaded, "that whatever correſpondence and actings, the ſaid "*Marquis* had with the confederate *Iriſh Catholicks*, "was allowed by the ſaid letters, inſtructions "and directions; and that it manifeſtly appears to "them, that the king our father was well pleaſed with "what the *Marquis* did, after he had done it; and

"approved

" approved the ſame:" and at the cloſe his majeſty makes this declaration, " that we find him " innocent from any malice, or rebellious purpoſe " againſt the crown, and that what he did by " way of correſpondence or compliance with the " *Iriſh* rebels, was in order to the ſervice of our " royal father, and warranted by his inſtructions, " and the truſt repoſed in him, and that the be- " nefit thereof accrued to the ſervice of the crown." The thing here owned and aſſerted, as the reſult of the examinations and enquiries made, is, that the *Marquis* had king *Charles* the *firſt*'s inſtruction for what he did, in correſponding with the *Iriſh*: the queſtion is, what theſe inſtructions refer to. And *Firſt*, 'Tis evident they refer to the ſervice in *Scotland* that is expreſſed. *Secondly*, I think the inſtructions have a farther reference, and muſt intend other correſpondence with the rebels, than drawing forces from them for the ſervice of *Scotland*: after the mention of that it follows, *beſides* theſe letters under his majeſty's hand, they had received evidence of *private* inſtructions, and are perſuaded, that *whatever* correſpondence or actings he had with the confederate *Roman catholicks* was allowed, *&c.* which I take to imply more than the forementioned ſervices: the lord *Clarendon*, as was ſhown, expreſly ſaith, " the *Marquis* betook him- " ſelf to the rebels, and that many things were " diſcovered againſt him, of his correſpondence " with the rebels." I recited from another author eight particulars to this purpoſe: the king in this letter owns ſecret inſtructions to the *Marquis*, and that *whatever* correſpondence he had with the rebels was warranted thereby: which to me ſeems to reſpect former correſpondence, and to imply that the king (*Charles* the *ſecond*) was ſenſible there had been ſuch a correſpondence. *Thirdly*, which is farther evident from this conſideration,

that if the king only intend a correſpondence with the rebels, in order to a peace with them, and to engage them for the ſervice of *Scotland*, his teſtimony in favour of the *Marquis* is nothing to the purpoſe: the matter *ſub judice*, and for which the *Marquis* was queſtioned, was *his having been one of the rebels*; for this he was tried before the council, *&c.* and being under the ſuſpicion and charge of it, was by the king himſelf ſent to the *Tower*, and confined ſeveral months there: after a full hearing, the king declares he finds him innocent from any malice, and rebellious purpoſes againſt the crown, and that what he did was warranted by his father's inſtructions: which ſaith Mr. *Carte*, *p.* 33. "wholly relates to the correſpondence, and actings the *Marquis* had with the "rebels, in order to get forces for *Montroſs*'s "aſſiſtance, or to make peace with them." But if ſo, I would ask, how doth this conclude in favour of the *Marquis?* the queſtion was, whether the *Marquis* had been engaged with the rebels: no, ſaith Mr. *Carte*, the king acquits him, and declares all he did, in order to the ſervice of *Scotland*, and in making peace with them, was by his father's inſtructions: where he plainly makes the king acquit the *Marquis* of a crime, he was not charged with, and that would not be eſteemed a crime. And the ſame miſtake Mr. *Wellwiſher* runs into, and, after his manner, triumphs in his own blunder. "But what relation, I deſire to "know, ſaith he, had the *Marquis* of *Antrim*'s "buſineſs to the *Iriſh Maſſacre?* will the king's "granting him a commiſſion three years after "(*viz.*) in 1644, to join *Montroſs* in *Scotland*, "in order to ſubdue the rebels there, prove the "king to be guilty of the *Iriſh Maſſacre?*" *p.* 56. But not too faſt, good ſir; the buſineſs of the

Marquis

Marquis of *Antrim* was quite another thing than you here repreſent it: he was not accuſed, and diſpoſſeſſed of his eſtate for joining *Montroſs*, and fighting againſt the *Scotch* proteſtant rebels; but for joining the *Iriſh* rebels, and murdering the *Iriſh* proteſtants: and, I deſire to know, what relation a commiſſion from the king to do the former, had to his being indemnified for the latter, and with what pertinency it could be alledged for that purpoſe. *Fourthly*, Suppoſing the *Marquis* had no concern in the rebellion, and king *Charles* was convinced of his innocency in that reſpect, it is ſtrange and unaccountable, that in a letter wrote on purpoſe in his favour, he ſhould not be expreſly cleared of it: 'tis certain he had been accounted a rebel, had been impriſoned even by king *Charles* himſelf, had his eſtate ſequeſtered; and yet 'tis not once ſaid in this letter, after all the examination there had been, both in *Ireland* and *England*, that it appeared he had never been in the rebellion. But I think the contrary is plainly implyed in the letter: the king doth indeed ſay that he found him innocent of any malice, or rebellious purpoſe againſt the crown; but that many others of the rebels pretended as well as he, and they were treated, as is well-known, according to ſuch a profeſſion.

The caſe of the *Marquis* ſeems, in ſhort, to be this, (thus gentleman and others muſt excuſe me if I can't accord with them in all their ſentiments: I do aſſure them, ſo far as I am capable of judging for my ſelf, I ſpeak not from prejudice, but from the evidence of the thing.) The *Marquis* had been early engaged in the rebellion; but meeting with a diſguſt, as hinted before, not having all the confidence and authority among the rebels he expected, he withdrew

drew from them, and had ſome correſpondence with the proteſtants: after a while he comes over to *Oxford*, where he pretended to the king, he had a mighty power and intereſt with the rebels; got himſelf made a *Marquis*, and in conjunction with *Daniel O Neal*, is ſent back into *Ireland*, to engage the rebels to turn their arms againſt the *Scotch*; by many then, and ſtill thought, the greater rebels of the two: the forces he raiſed, commanded by his brother *Macdonel*, joined *Montroſs* in *Scotland*, where they were very ſucceſsful againſt the covenanters: he's alſo ſaid to have aſſiſted king *Charles*, with arms and ammunition whilſt in the *Weſt*, and to have furniſhed him with ſhips to make his eſcape beyond-ſea: theſe ſervices (the merit of which the king diſcovers a great ſenſe of in his letter) would incline the king to ſhew him what favour he could; and therefore to remove the odium and objections againſt him, on the ſcore of the *Iriſh* rebellion, he declares the *Marquis* had not only a loyal and good intention, in all he did, but inſtructions and warrant from his father for it.

I don't expect this account, or any thing that has been ſaid, will ſatisfy the gentleman I am more immediately concerned with: it may however ſerve for an apology, and defence againſt the charge of unreaſonable prejudice, malice, baſeneſs, and all that's nought, ſo confidently advanced againſt thoſe, that relate this paſſage; nor ſhould I, but upon this view, have taken ſo much pains in examining it: whether the ſtory be true or not, in all the circumſtances of it, I don't pretend to be certain; but I am ſure a great many things, our author has offered to diſprove it, conclude nothing to his purpoſe. I mentioned it in the *Memorial*, upon a particular occaſion, pertinent to my deſign, and with ſeveral charitable

charitable conceſſions towards the king; and only told the ſtory, as I had it from Mr. *Baxter*, who, I queſtion not, had reaſon ſufficient to warrant what he publiſhed, and, it's like, more evidence of the truth of it, than we can pretend to at this diſtance: but for this gentleman, and others to repreſent the ſtory as demonſtratively falſe, and yet put off their readers with ſuch paralogiſms inſtead of argument, as they generally do; and then cry out of all that won't ſubmit to their dictates, as wicked ſlanderers, *&c.* is a conduct that deſerves rebuke. With how much freedom, this way, our author has treated Mr. *Baxter*, may be ſeen in his pamphlet: I ſhall give a few ſpecimens of his candor and charity: ſpeaking of king *Charles* the *ſecond* his letter, (*p.* 33.) he ſaith, " it ſo expreſly " tells us, this to be the end of all the king's in- " ſtructions, and the *Marquis*'s correſpondence, " that Mr. *Baxter*, did he not read the letter with " the blindeſt prejudice, or was he not reſolved to " pervert its true meaning, muſt ſee it: but ſo " fair, ſo juſt a conſtruction would not ſerve his " purpoſe." To diſcern the juſtice of this cenſure, the reader need only reflect upon what has been, more than once, hinted before; that if this be all the correſpondence king *Charles* warranted, it could be no defence againſt the charge upon the *Marquis*, *viz.* of rebellion; and therefore muſt be impertinent. But to let this paſs, why might he not ſuppoſe Mr. *Baxter* might miſtake the letter, without being reſolved to pervert it? I profeſs, notwithſtanding all the aſſiſtance this ſharp ſighted man has afforded, I can ſee no ſuch thing in the letter as he imagines; but I think quite the contrary: after ſeveral ſallies of his charity, much in the ſame ſtrain, his zeal, contracted like the beams of the ſun in a burning glaſs, takes fire, *p.* 41. " for a man,

ſaith

" ſaith he, to charge the *Marquis* of *Antrim* " with being concerned in the beginning of the " rebellion, without a ſingle fact in hiſtory to " ſupport the charge, is certainly a wickedneſs of a " very heinous nature: to do this, and to wreſt " the words of a letter, in order to ſtrain the ho- " nour of one of the beſt of princes, that ever " filled a throne," (and here he falls into a long harangue from an heated imagination, and concludes) " this has in it all the circumſtances of baſeneſs; " is a practice ſo full of horror, an iniquity of " ſuch a ſize, as I want words to expreſs its " juſt demerit; and yet this is what Mr. *Baxter* " hath done, with what conſcience let all indif- " ferent people judge:" I don't queſtion but this warm man thinks he has truth, juſtice, and conſcience on his ſide; and only deſire he'll give other people leave to pretend to the ſame as well as he, and not take upon him to judge in things without his ſphere; which is the more unwarrant-able, and preſumptuous, when it is done in a cauſe, that can't bear an impartial examination: the world is weary of dictating, and ſuch as are impartial will judge of perſons and things according to e-vidence, and not be determined by confident aſ-ſertions: nor can I think theſe gentlemen have merited ſo much of mankind, as that they may ſet up what idols they pleaſe, and then rage at all that won't bow down to them. In the like manner, and with equal rudeneſs he falls on Dr. *Calamy*, *p.* 43. for ſaying, " that, as providence " ordered it, a certain memorable particularity, " (*viz.*) the ſtory of the *Marquis* of *Antrim*, " helped to ſet this matter in a clear light;" " which, he thinks, is calling on God to war- " rant the murdering the king in his memo- " ry, as the regicides did, to warrant the mur-

" dering

dering him in his perſon: but ſuppoſe Dr. *Calamy* ſuſpected, the *Iriſh* rebels had countenance from the court, (and I have offered reaſons that I think will juſtify the ſuſpicion) why might he not think providence had an hand in this matter, ſuffering the *Marquiſs*'s adverſaries ſo far to proſecute their cauſe againſt him, as that he ſhould be forced to ſpeak out before the world, and diſcover the whole truth? if not *a ſparrow, much leſs the lyon, falls to the ground without the providence of God.*

There is one particular more among this author's cenſures, that I muſt not paſs over, 'tis ſo very extraordinary: "ſome people, ſaith he, have "their reaſon and faith under ſo abſolute a com- "mand, and in ſo entire a ſubjection to their "own inclinations and paſſions, or the intereſt of "their cauſe and party, as to reject even the "cleareſt evidence, if they have but ſome piece "of ſecret hiſtory, an unatteſted, ſtudiouſly con- "cealed memorandum, or an uncertain ſtory to "oppoſe to them; I'll therefore at large conſider "this ſtory, as related by Mr. *Baxter*, and after "him by Dr. *Calamy*;" *p.* 22. But good, Sir! whatever party and paſſion, you are ſure, Mr. *Baxter* and others have to gratify, by telling his ſtory, how come you to call it a piece of ſecret hiſtory? is a thing tranſacted *openly*, in the parliament houſe of *England*, a ſecret? of this nature was the fact Mr. *Baxter*'s ſtory refers to! A wonderful ſecret! However ſince it muſt be ſo, let it paſs for a piece of ſecret hiſtory; but then I ſhall be willing to know, what account we muſt make of the two admirable ſtories Mr. *Carte* tells us in his poſtſcript; the firſt, concerning Mr. *Henderſon*, he ſaith, is publick enough; and therefore

he doth not recite it; only puts the gentleman in mind of it, whom he is calling to repentance, by Mr. *Henderſon*'s example. I am not certain that every reader is acquainted with this matter, as publick as Mr. *Carte* thinks it; and therefore I ſhall give ſome ſhort account of it, as related by one of Mr. *Welbviſher*'s excellent, admirable writers, Dr. *Hollinworth*; the ſtory in ſhort is, that Mr. *Alexander Henderſon*, before he died, repented of, and recanted his oppoſition to king *Charles* the *firſt*: this is publiſhed in a long paper, which Dr. *Hollinworth* calls *the declaration of Mr.* Alexander Henderſon, *principal miniſter of the word of God at* Edenburgh, *and chief commiſſioner from the* Kirk *of* Scotland, *to the parliament, and ſynod of* England, *upon his death-bed:* an abſtract of this pretended declaration, is as follows.

" Whereas the greateſt part of the diſtempered " people of theſe miſerable, diſtracted kingdoms " have been, and are wholly abuſed with malici- " ous miſinformations againſt his ſacred majeſty, " eſpecially in point of religion and moral wiſ- " dom, whereof I confeſs, with great grief of " heart, my ſelf (amongſt many of my coat) " none of the leaſt, who, out of imaginary fears " and jealouſies, were made real inſtruments, to ad- " vance this unnatural war, wherein ſo much innocent " proteſtant blood hath been ſhed, to the ſcan- " dal of the true reformed religion, *&c.* I con- " clude it the duty of a good chriſtian, eſpeci- " ally one of my profeſſion, and in the conditi- " on I lie, expecting God Almighty's call, not " only to acknowledge to the all-merciful God, " with an humble ſincere remorſe of conſcience, " the greatneſs of this offence; but alſo for the " better ſatisfaction of others, to publiſh this de-

" claration

" claration to the view of the world, to the in-
" tent that all thoſe (eſpecially of the miniſtry)
" who have been deluded with me, may, by God's
" grace, and my example, not only be undeceiv-
" ed themſelves, but alſo ſtirred up to undeceive
" others; that ſcandal may be removed from our
" religion, and the good king reſtored to his
" juſt rights, and truly honoured and obeyed as
" God's anointed, and vicegerent upon earth, *&c.*
" I do therefore declare before God and the
" world, that, ſince I had the honour and hap-
" pineſs to confer with the king, eſpecially in
" matters of religion, whether in relation to the
" *Kirk*, or ſtate (which, like *Hippocrates*'s twins, are
" linked together) that I found him the moſt
" intelligent man I ever convers'd with. I was
" aſtoniſhed at the quickneſs of his reaſons and
" replies, and was convinced in conſcience, and
" knew not how to give him any reaſonable ſatiſ-
" faction: and yet the ſweetneſs of his diſpoſi-
" tion was ſuch, as made me think ſo much wiſdom,
" and moderation could not be without an extraor-
" dinary meaſure of divine grace. I obſerved all
" his actions, particularly thoſe of devotion, which
" I muſt truly ſay are more than ordinary: O! that
" thoſe, who ſit now at the helm of theſe weather
" beaten kingdoms, had but half his piety: If I
" ſhould ſpeak of his juſtice, magnanimity, chari-
" ty, ſobriety, chaſtity, patience, humility, and
" of all his both chriſtian, and moral vir-
" tues, I ſhould run my ſelf into a panegyrick:
" *&c.* No man can ſay there is conſpicuouſly
" any predominant vice in him: never man ſaw
" him paſſionately angry; never man heard him
" curſe, or given to ſwearing; never man heard
" him complain in the greateſt durance of war,
" or confinement, *&c.*" After this and a great

deal more put into the mouth, or brought to the pen of Mr. *Henderſon*, the worthy Doctor concludes, " I hope thoſe men, who have of " late ſo boldly ventured to throw the moſt " ſtinking dirt, in the face of this great prince, " and patient martyr, will by repentance give " glory to God:" and in like manner Mr. *Carte* (the author I am now concerned with) thinks this example of Mr. *Henderſon*'s ſhould lead Mr. *Chandler* to repentance, (*i. e.* of his obſtinacy, in not being convinced, the *Marquiſs* of *Antrim* had no concern in the *Iriſh* rebellion, or had any inſtructions from king *Charles*, for what he did therein) I have ſpent too much time already in this gentleman's pamphlet, and therefore ſhall only ſay two things to his tale of Mr. *Henderſon*'s recantation, which he lays ſo much ſtreſs upon, and repreſents as publickly known.

Firſt, That it is a piece of *ſecret hiſtory*: ſo that by his cenſure, which I mentioned before, he condemns himſelf, and makes a rod for his own back. Mr. *Baxter* and others are arraigned, for alledging a private memorandum, (a letter read *ſecretly* in the houſe of commons) and yet Mr. *Henderſon*'s declaration is a publick authentick inſtrument. Pray, Sir, in whoſe preſence was it made? who atteſted it? have you more vouchers for it, than the gentlemen that conſtituted the parliament of *England*? all that Dr. *Hollinworth*, who has publiſhed it to the world, and from whom, I ſuppoſe, our author learn't it, has to ſay of it is, " that it was com- " municated to him, ſome weeks ago, by the re- " verend Mr. *Lamplugh*, ſon to the late arch-bi- " ſhop of *York*;" I add,

Secondly,

Secondly, That the whole ſtory is a fiction: this I think is ſufficiently proved by the author of a pamphlet, called *truth brought to light*; or the forgeries of Dr. *Hollinworth* detected, printed in the year 1693. I ſhall briefly remark two or three things concerning it, (*Firſt*) The ſecrecy of it is an argument that it's a fiction: who can imagine, but if he had made ſuch a declaration, it would have been ſpread through the kingdom, and been in every body's mouth, both friends and enemies; eſpecially ſince one end of Mr. *Henderſon* in his pretended declaration, as is eſpecially ſaid in it, was to vindicate the king, undeceive others, and ſtir up his brethren in the miniſtry to do the like: now if this was the deſign of his declaration, would not one expect he ſhould have made it to his brethren, and before them, or at leaſt have taken care to have it communicated to them? but nothing of this was done; neither presbyterians, nor epiſcopalians, ſo far as I can learn, heard one word of it at that time; but the whole matter remained a ſecret, under the ſeal of confeſſion, till Dr. *Hollinworth*, and his friends were pleaſed to divulge it. (*Secondly*) The ſtile declares it an impoſture: it makes the pretended author ſpeak ſo unlike, either a *Scotchman* or a presbyterian, as is a ſtrong preſumption Mr. *Henderſon* never penned it: indeed there are ſome few *Scotch* words, but more *Engliſh*, and ſuch as favour nothing of Mr. *Henderſon*'s dialect. But (*Thirdly*) That which manifeſts the fraud, beyond all reaſonable queſtion is, a publick teſtimony of the general aſſembly of the *kirk* of *Scotland*: the aſſembly, upon the publiſhing of this declaration by Dr. *Hollinworth*, appointed a committee to examine the matter; and after a full examination of it,

it, declares the whole a ſorgery: this may be ſeen more at large in the acts of the general aſſembly for the year 1648. After they had ſignified their ſatisfaction, and aſſurance, that Mr. *Henderſon* perſevered in the ſentiments he had formerly had, they take notice, " he was greatly decayed in " his natural ſtrength, when he left king *Charles* " at *Newcaſtle*, and had his laſt conference with " him there; that he came from thence by ſea, " in a languiſhing condition to *Scotland*, and di- " ed in eight days after his arrival; that he was " not able to frame any ſuch declaration as this, " and that all he ſpoke on his death-bed, ſhow'd " his judgment was the ſame as before, about the " cauſe of reformation." This was atteſted before the aſſembly by ſeveral miniſters, that viſited him upon his death-bed; and particularly by two, that conſtantly attended him, from the time he came home, till he expired: after this and a great deal more, too long to be here incerted, they declare the ſaid pamphlet, (*viz.*) of Dr. *Hollingworth*, entitled the declaration of Mr. *Henderſon*, &c. " *to be forged, ſcandalous, and falſe*; and the au- " thor, and contriver of the ſame to be void of " charity, and a good conſcience; *and a groſs li-* " *ar*, and calumniator, led by the ſpirit of the " accuſer of the brethren." And is not this a fine ſtory for Mr. *Carte* to trump up, and refer to, as undoubted matter of fact, and that at the ſame time that he's inſulting Mr. *Baxter* and others, for dealing in ſecret hiſtories, and private memorandums.

The other ſtory concerns Mr. *Vines*; and an excellent document for repentance 'tis! Mr. *Vines*, he tells us, was a very celebrated man among the presbyterians, in the time of the rebellion, of whoſe

whoſe ſentiments of king *Charles*, after the treaty at *Uxbridge*, take, ſaith he, this account, as it was given about the year 1675, by Mr. *Nathaniel Gilbert* of *Coventry*, in an information ſubſcribed by his own hand: " when Mr. *Vines* returned " from the treaty of *Uxbridge*, Mr. *Walden* being " at *London* with Mr. *Nathaniel Gilbert*, news " was brought to them that Mr. *Vines* was re- " turned; whereupon they both went to Mr. " *Vines*, who after uſual ceremonies between friends, " ſaid with great affection, Brother *Walden!* how " has this nation been fooled? we have been told " our king was a child and a fool; but if I un- " derſtand any thing by my converſe with him, " which I have had with great liberty, he is as " much a chriſtian prince, as ever I read or heard " of ſince our ſaviour's time; he alſo, ſaid he, " is a very precious prince, and is able himſelf " to argue with the ableſt divines we have; and " that he gave ſuch undeniable evidences of epiſ- " copacy, *&c.* that the world could not anſwer " them; that he had convinced him it was a- " greable to the primitive times: as for his cler- " gy, there is no fence againſt their flails: they " are a great deal too hard for us, and that a- " mong all the kings of *Iſrael* and *Judah*, there " was none like him." Now as to this I ob- ſerve.

Firſt, That 'tis at beſt *a piece of ſecret hiſtory:* much more ſo, than that which this gentleman upbraids Mr. *Baxter* with: and if it was any reaſon againſt Mr. *Baxter*'s ſtory, and for rejecting it, that he thinks it a ſecret hiſtory, methinks, 'tis not over modeſt in our author, thus to trade in ſecrets, and expect ſo ready a belief as he ſeems to do: all the evidence he produces here,

is

is the declaration of Mr. *Nathaniel Gilbert* of *Coventry*, about the year 1675, the original whereof he ſaith, is in the hand of his father, miniſter of St. *Martins* in *Leiceſter*; and what Mr. *Carte* the ſon has publiſhed, as above, is from an atteſted copy: I can object nothing to the truth of the copy, nor any thing againſt the author of the original; for I know nothing of him, but what this gentleman tells me, (*viz.*) that he was related to his great grandmother: however he muſt allow me to call it a *piece of ſecret hiſtory*, a private memorandum: I am ſure, 'tis not quite ſo publick as Mr. *Baxter's ſecret* letter, read in the parliament houſe

Secondly, The information ſeems to me a little ſuſpicious; 'tis, I perceive, without date; he ſaith it was about the year 1675, which is thirty years after the *Uxbridge* treaty, which was in 1744; ſo that the credit of the ſtory depends upon an undated information, thirty years after the fact, by the author's own account; though really he knows nothing certain of it's date; it was, he ſaith, about the year 1675; but how much ſooner or later, he can't tell: till that time the matter lay concealed, for ought appears to the contrary: and I leave the reader to judge, how probable it is that it would have been concealed, had it been true: Mr. *Vines* was a publick and popular man, is repreſented here, upon the firſt meeting with his two friends, as falling upon a diſcourſe of the king's excellency, and his own conviction of the truth of epiſcopacy: and is it not ſtrange, if his conviction was ſuch as is pretended, he ſhould ſay nothing of it but to theſe perſons? and that neither they, nor any others ſhould talk of it, and ſpread it abroad, till thirty years after a private

private memorandum is given of it, which now at length this gentleman imparts to the world?

Thirdly, I can't but ſuſpect it is entirely groundleſs. The gentleman muſt excuſe my freedom. I aſſure him I bear no ill will againſt his great grand-mother's relation, but in the ſpace of thirty years his memory might fail him: my reaſon is, that it's utterly inconſiſtent with Mr. *Vines*'s after conduct and practice. Mr. *Vines*, after this pretended declaration in favour of the king, and his cauſe, and particularly of epiſcopacy, ſtill adhered to the parliament, and to presbytery; preached upon ſeveral publick occaſions, in his uſual ſtrain; in the year 1648, he attended the parliaments commiſſioners, at the treaty in the iſle of *Wight*; when he, with ſome other presbyterian divines, had a diſpute with the king's chaplains about epiſcopacy; in which Mr. *Vines* diſtinguiſhed himſelf, and, 'tis ſaid, plyed the learned Dr. *Hammond* ſo cloſely with his arguments, that the king interpoſed: how well this agrees with the ſtory, told by the half brother of Mr. *Carte*'s great grand-mother, I leave him to conſider. But it's time to take leave of Mr. *Carte*'s performance, in which he pretends to ſet the *Iriſh* maſſacre in a clear light, confute Mr. *Baxter*, and Dr. *Calamy*, and run down all that preſume to entertain ſentiments, in theſe matters, different from his. I have conſidered what he has advanced, particularly about the *Marquis* of *Antrim*; and muſt own, I am ſo far from being convinced, that upon a cloſer examination of the matter, I am the more confirmed in my ſuſpicion of it; and, I hope, what has been offered may be ſufficient to warrant that ſuſpicion, and to vindicate my ſelf, and others, who have related theſe hiſtorical paſſages, this au-

thor cavils at, from his raſh and uncharitable cenſures; the modeſty of which, eſpecially the laſt mentioned (that ſome men have their reaſon and faith under ſo abſolute a command, and in ſo entire a ſubjection to their inclinations and paſſions, as to reject the cleareſt evidence, if they have but a piece of ſecret hiſtory, an undated concealed memorandum to oppoſe to it) the reader may judge of, without any farther comment. I only deſire he'll remember Mr. *Baxter*'s private ſtory, and ſecret hiſtory is a letter read in the parliament houſe, for which this gentleman repremands him with too much authority: and after this produces the two ſtories as before, concerning Mr. *Henderſon* and Mr. *Vines*; the one of a publick recantation upon his death-bed, which thoſe that attended him never heard a word of, and which the general aſſembly declares *falſe and ſcandalous:* the other of a recantation, witneſſed thirty years after, and diſproved by avowed known principles, and a courſe of practice afterwards. Indeed this is done by the *reverend* Mr. *Thomas Carte*, and therefore muſt be gently touched; had it been done by ſuch a perſon as Mr. *Chandler*, a *diſſenting teacher* (for ſo his own title page makes the difference) one would have been ready to have ſaid, *ſome men have a face of braſs, though their heads happen to be of ſofter metal.*

I now return to Mr. *Wellwiſher*, and ſhall haſten through the remaining part of his book.

P. 62. He brings in the *Memorial*, as ſaying, *p.* 286. *they were church of* England *men that began the quarrel with the king; as the earl of* Eſſex, *Sir* John Hotham, *Biſhop* Williams, *Dr.* Gauden, *&c.* (I paſs over ſome paragraphs here, and leave them

them to be admired by the reader) upon which our author judiciouſly obſerves, " if they were " ſo, they moſt certainly acted not upon church " of *England*, but *preſbyterian* principles: though " they might originally be in the church, yet " as ſoon as they began to rebel, not one of them " continued of it." What I aſſert is, that they were church of *England* men that began the quarrel; for which I have the authority of lord *Clarendon*, and other hiſtorians cited in the *Memorial*; they were baptized in the church, were in communion with it, were zealous of epiſcopacy, the common prayer, hierarchy, *&c.* Theſe were the men that began the quarrel; and I thought I had ſufficient reaſon to call them church of *England* men. No, ſaith this learned author; for as ſoon as they took up arms, they ceaſed to be church of *England* men: an admirable argument! the ſtrength of which lies in this, that non-reſiſtance being an eſſential article of the church of *England*, theſe gentlemen, by reſiſting the higher powers, and taking up arms againſt the king, cut themſelves off from the church: but if ſo, I ſhould be glad to be inform'd, what are the bounds and limits of the church of *England*; with the proper characteriſticks of its members; whether the revolution cut off all, that join'd in it, from the church; whether they that take the oaths to the preſent government, belong to the church of *England*; what church this worthy man himſelf is of. To ſay that the church, as by law eſtabliſhed, maintains non-reſiſtance, as one of it's eſſential doctrines, and that there was no reſiſtance at the revolution, is ſo wild and extravagant a notion, ſo contrary to known facts, that it deſerves no confutation except the pillory. But after all, 'tis allowed they were church of *Eng-*

land men (had all the marks, by which that body of chriſtians are diſtinguiſhed from others) *before*, and *till* they began the quarrel, which is enough for my purpoſe; he may make what he pleaſes of them afterwards: he ſaith indeed none ever attempted to prove this before, that they were members of the church of *England*, who firſt engaged againſt the king, but a diſſenting brother at *Exeter*, and calls my attempt an extraordinary ſtep: but his aſſertion muſt be an extraordinary blunder, or ſomething worſe, when in the very pages of the *Memorial* then under his eye, he finds ſeveral mentioned maintaining the ſame thing; as the lord *Clarendon*, and Mr. *Baxter*, who wrote long before the diſſenting brother at *Exeter*. But ſuch is the man, and his manner.

P. 64. "he gives us to underſtand (*Memorial* "*p.* 288.) that Dr. *Gauden* was the author of "the Εἰκὼν βασιλικὴ· and as a proof, he men- "tions a memorandum of the earl of *Angleſey*, "in which king *Charles* the *ſecond*, and king "*James* the *ſecond*, are both ſaid to have own'd, "that Dr. *Gauden* was the author of it." But this, ſaith he, is eaſily anſwered; and then goes on to quote his worthy and authentick authors. as I have no concern in this matter, it being perfectly indifferent to me, who was the author of that book, I don't think it worth my while to enter upon a particular, and large examination of it; eſpecially ſince that has been done ſo often already. I mentioned it in the *Memorial* only by the by, in a marginal note, and produc'd authorities for all I ſaid about it; which, one would expect, might have been ſufficient to have protected me, from the reſentments of Mr.

Wellwiſher:

Welhwiſher: but it happens otherwiſe: the worthy man not only rejects my authorities, but has counter authorities at command, and wonders it ſhould be any diſpute, which are to be prefer'd: and having, as he thinks, prov'd his point, by a torrent of admirable excellent reaſoning, (exactly like himſelf) and the help of his admirable excellent writers, he concludes in the words of one of them, *p*, 68. "As long as this book remains in the "world, and that, I preſume, will be as long as "this nation laſts, the monſtrous and abominable "wickedneſs of that party will ſtand upon re-"cord; and they will be an hiſſing, an aſtoniſh-"ment, an execration, and a curſe to all poſteri-"ty for evermore." To ſuch phrency and downright phanaticiſm doth ſome mens blind zeal tranſport them! I can't imagine the party here level'd at, are in any danger of being brought under a curſe, whoever was the author of that book: ſuppoſe king *Charles*, it doth not at all affect the merits of the cauſe between him and the parliament; no more, for ought I ſee, than *Don Quixot*: as for my ſelf I can truly ſay, I ſhould have the very ſame opinion of the cauſe that I have, did I believe king *Charles* wrote every ſyllable of it: ſo that, as I ſaid before, this is a matter in which I have no concern, and about which I can expreſs no zeal. Notwithſtanding, as this learned man found himſelf qualified to ſay ſomething to the ſubject, by the aſſiſtance of ſundry of his worthy friends, and has thought fit to bring it in as matter of exception, and cavil againſt the *Memorial*, I ſhall once more go out of my way to talk a little with him; and ſhall conſider the proofs he offers, and ſo much triumphs in, *that king* Charles, *and not Dr.* Gauden, *was the writer of the* εἰκὼν βασιλικὴ.

Firſt,

First,) He alleges, from the worthy vindicator, as he calls him, " That both king *Charles*, and " king *James* the *ſecond* atteſted, that king *Charles* " the *firſt* was the author of this book, by their " letters patent to Mr. *Royſton*, giving him the " ſole privilege of printing the works of king " *Charles* the *firſt*, and expreſly mentions Mr. " *Royſton*'s fidelity to him in theſe remarkable " words, in printing and publiſhing many meſ- " ſages and papers of our bleſſed father; *eſpecially* " *thoſe moſt excellent diſcourſes and ſoliloquies entitled* " Εἰκὼν Βασιλικὴ:," and this he calls a pub- lick, authoritative atteſtation of the kings themſelves. I anſwer, *Firſt*, Here is no atteſtation at all; they do indeed mention the Εἰκὼν among the king's papers, but don't aſſert any thing about it; though no queſtion they deſigned to have it paſs for his: but this is but a ſlender argument that they knew, or thought it to be ſo; thoſe that aſcribe it to Dr. *Gauden*, own he undertook it to ſerve the king's intereſt, and tell us, " that the lord " *Marquis* of *Hertford* took it with him to the " treaty, at the iſle of *Wight*, and ſhow'd it the " king, and recommended the putting it out in " his own name; urging this as a reaſon, that *Crom-* " *well* and others of the army, having got a " great reputation with the people, for parts and " piety, it would be of ſervice to his majeſty " to have it put out in his name." Now if the book was written upon this view, as Dr. *Gauden*'s friends confeſs it was (and accordingly they tell us, he pleaded this ſervice as an ex- traordinary merit with king *Charles* the *ſecond*, after the reſtoration, and had thereupon the pro- miſe of the biſhoprick of *Wincheſter*) we can't wonder it ſhould be mentioned as the king's, by king

king *Charles* and *James* the ſecond. The king had then got the name and honour of it; it was generally call'd his, and great uſe was to be made of it, to advance the king's reputation, and blaſt that of his enemies; few were in the ſecret, and were acquainted with the juggle; and thoſe that were thought proper to conceal it; and that the two royal brothers ſhould ſo far countenance the errour (ſuppoſing it an errour) as to reckon it among their father's books, is not ſtrange, and, I think, affords no argument at all, for the purpoſe this gentleman mentions it: king *Charles* the *firſt* called them at *Weſtminſter* a parliament; and yet tells the queen, his calling them ſo, did by no means imply his allowing them to be a parliament: he only uſed the common ſtile. *Secondly*, As this can't juſtly be eſteemed an atteſtation from king *Charles*, and king *James*, and is eaſily accounted for, ſo we have a direct and full atteſtation from theſe princes to the contrary; I mean in the memorandum of the earl of *Angleſey*, recited in the *Memorial*; he ſaith they both aſſur'd him that the εἰκὼν was not of the late king's compiling, but made by Dr. *Gauden*; which the earl atteſted under his hand, for the undeceiving others. This memorandum was found upon a blank leaf of the εἰκὼν, when the earl's books were auctioned by *Millington*, and was perus'd by many. Mr. *Wellwiſher* ſaith, it was rarely ſeen, but by thoſe of *Millington*'s own party; by which he intimates it was often ſeen by one party, and ſometimes by the other party, *though more rarely*. Dr. *Walker* particularly, a zealous loyaliſt, aſſures us he ſaw it: if it be true, which this gentleman objects, that *Millington* refuſs'd to ſhow it to Mr. *Wagſtaff* and others, that could never ſatisfy Dr. *Walker* and the reſt,

that

that there was no ſuch memorandum, or that it was a forgery, when they ſaw it with their own eyes; but granting the memorandum is not a ſufficient evidence, that king *Charles* was not the author, 'tis however a better evidence againſt it, than the letters patent, cited by Mr. *Wellwiſher*, are on the other ſide.

Secondly.) He alledges, "that Dr. *Walker*, and "the reſt of the vindicators of Dr. *Gauden*, don't "pretend, that the book was drawn up before "the treaty in the iſle of *Wight*; whereas it muſt "be owned, by the greateſt oppugners of the "king's right, that ſeventeen chapters of the εἰκὼν, "with the reſt of the king's papers wrote with "his own hand, were taken at the fatal battle of "*Naſeby*, and were recovered again, and reſtored "to his majeſty by major *Huntington*, as has been "inconteſtably proved by Mr. *Wagſtaff*, from ma-"jor *Huntington*'s teſtimony, atteſted by a cloud "of witneſſes; ſo that it is plain, from their own "account, that Dr. *Gauden* could not be the au-"thor, *p.* 66." And this, I own, is an argument to the purpoſe: no man can with any juſtice, or modeſty, claim to be the author of a book, the greateſt part of which was ſeen, and read ſeveral years before he pretended to write: ſo that if it be true, that ſeventeen chapters of the εἰκὼν were taken among the king's papers at *Naſeby*, it can not be true, as is ſaid by thoſe that make biſhop *Gauden* the author, that the king never ſaw it till the treaty at the iſle of *Wight*, and conſequently, the whole ſtory about Dr. *Gauden* is overthrown. It is obſervable in what a manner this ſtrenuous defender tells his tale: He ſaith, it muſt be owned, by the greateſt oppugners of the king's right, that ſeventeen chapters were taken

ken at *Naſeby*; whereas he knows it is not owned, and might know it could not be owned by them, without making themſelves ridiculous. Dr. *Walker*, who declares he knew biſhop *Gauden*, and not king *Charles*, wrote the book, and was privy to the whole affair, could not but be ſurprized to hear of major *Huntington*'s teſtifying a thing, that he was aſſured was impoſſible to be true; and therefore ſeeks an opportunity of diſcourſing the major upon the ſubject; which at laſt he obtained; and has publiſhed to the world the major's account of the matter, which I ſhall ſubjoin: "I "will, ſaith he, declare in the faith of a chriſti- "an, what I had from major *Huntington*'s own "mouth, without diminution, or wreſting of it. "I had ſo often heard major *Huntington*'s teſti- "mony alledged, that whilſt he attended his ma- "jeſty, or had the guarding of him, he ſaw the "king frequently take theſe papers out of his ca- "binet, and ſometimes read them, ſometimes write "more; and that when he ſaw the book Εἰκὼν, "he declared, thoſe chapters in it were thoſe very "papers he had ſeen: I having often heard this "alledged, and knowing it was impoſſible to be "true, I had as earneſt a deſire to ſpeak with the "major, as ever I had with any man." At laſt he met with the major at *Tunbridge-wells*, and having prepared the way for an interview with him, he told him what he had heard, and earneſtly entreated him to tell him what he knew, or had ſaid of that book; to which the major condeſcended, and began thus: "'Tis like you have heard how "much trouble this has put me to; I have been "examined by one committee after another, and "that, time after time about it, and many things "alledged that I ſhould ſay: but I will tell you "freely and fully all that I know, or ever ſaid

" concerning it; which was this: When the book " was publiſhed, and ſo confidently reported to be " the king's, I ſaid, *Then ſurely, or I believe theſe* " *are the papers, I ſaw him ſo uſually take out of* " *his cabinet:* but this was but my conjecture, " and I never declared it to be otherwiſe; for I " aſſure you, I never read one line or word of " the papers in the king's hand. I can not ſay " there was one paſſage in thoſe papers, that is in " the printed book; for how ſhould I, never " having looked into them? This account, ſaith " Dr. *Walker*, of major *Huntington*'s, as in the ſight " of God, I faithfuly relate *." Now, if Dr. *Walker* may be credited, the major's teſtimony, upon which ſo great ſtreſs is laid, proves nothing in the queſtion before us; and, it is plain, was laid hold of and wreſted to ſerve a turn. The major frequently ſaw papers in the king's hand, before thoſe, pretended to be wrote by biſhop *Gauden*, were carried to the king: immediately after the king's death, a book is publiſhed, and aſcribed to the king; hereupon ſaith the major, " I *be-* " *lieve* theſe were the papers I ſaw;" though he owns, he had no evidence of it, and knew not one word in thoſe papers; and yet this is ſufficient with ſome men, to raiſe a demonſtration upon, and warrant their inſulting ſuch, as can't believe all their fancies and chimera's.

Thirdly.) 'Tis urged in the ſame cauſe, as a proof that the king wrote the book, and not Dr. *Gauden*, that the ſtile doth not agree with Dr.

---

* True account of the author of Εἰκὼν Βασιλικὴ. page 32.

Gauden's

Gauden's; and our author thinks, if I (or any of my party) would compare the εἰκὼν with biſhop *Gauden*'s ſermons and other writings, I might (if capable of conviction) be convinced, that Dr. *Gauden* could not be the author of one ſingle line of it: and preſently comes in the terrible FOR, (that has done him ſo much ſervice all along) "FOR he that ſaith he was the author, lies under this "diſadvantage, that he ſaith what is incredible in "the nature of things, *p.* 67." and a greater diſadvantage a man can not well lie under: he concludes, "if there was no other argument, or evi-"dence that Dr. *Gauden* did not write this book, "this only, that *he could not*, might be ſufficient "to convince every ſenſible and unprejudiced per-"ſon;" he might have ſaid, convince any one not quite mad; for who in his wits will believe a man has done, what he could not do? *ultra poſſe non datur eſſe.* Another of our author's worthy men ſaith, "He is perſuaded no perſon was "able to frame this book, but a ſuffering king; "and no ſuffering king, *but king* Charles *the mar-*"*tyr:*" and if this be ſo, there ought to be an end of the debate for ever; for if Dr. *Gauden could not* write it, it is certain *he did not*; and if none but king *Charles could* write it, it is as certain he muſt be the author. But this, I am afraid, will not ſatisfy every one: it is poſſible for a man to change his ſtile, and to imitate another's ſtile: ſuppoſing this book is written like a king, a ſuffering king, and the martyr-king, I am not ſure but Dr. *Gauden* might be able to perſonate him in ſuch a manner, as to deceive as great a critick as our author. Dr. *Walker* has at large anſwered this objection, in the 11th and 25th pages of his *True account*, &c. among other particulars he takes notice, "That it "is no new, nor ſtrange thing, for one man to

" perſonate another, and to write and ſpeak as is
" ſuitable to, and uſual for men in ſuch circum-
" ſtances; and frequently, when their fancies are
" warmed, the copy out-doth the original; and he
" never ſeems to have read a romance, the poets
" ſcenical or others, or the *Greek* and *Roman* hi-
" ſtories, who can not give inſtances of all the
" paſſions raiſed, and expreſſions ſuitable put into
" the mouths of them, for whoſe uſe they were
" deſigned; and uttered with a warmer pathos, than
" they would have been by the perſons themſelves,
" perſonated by them. The proof of this is a-
" bove all exception, in books of devotion, in
" which we find the greateſt variety of proſopo-
" poeias in meditations, ſoliloquies, ejaculations, a-
" ſpirations, *&c.* compoſed by the authors of them,
" who cannot be ſuppoſed to be in all the con-
" ditions themſelves, but to fit them for thoſe, who
" may be in a condition, in which it will be pro-
" per for them to uſe them:" He adds, *p.* 26.
" that they who draw up ſpeeches to be ſpoken
" by the king in parliament, declarations, *&c.* do
" not keep their own ſtile, air, and manner of
" thinking; but do the beſt they can, to adapt
" them to the royal perſon, for whoſe uſe they
" prepared them; and thus it moſt evidently was
" in the preſent caſe:" nor is it impertinently al-
ledged, *p.* 12, " that the evenneſs of the thought,
" and expreſſion of this book, the equality of the
" ſtile, affection, and the ſame thread running quite
" through, from firſt to laſt, rather argues it an ar-
" tificial compoſure of one, who had vacancy for
" ſedate and deliberate thinking, than of him, for
" whoſe εἰκὼν and pourtraiture it was deſigned; who
" was encompaſſed with ſo diſtracting a hurry of mi-
" ſeries, as muſt often change the temper of his mind."
So that if we may ſuppoſe Dr. *Gauden* believed it
lawful

lawful to undertake ſuch a work, for the king's honour and ſervice, I cannot think the performance very difficult, much leſs, as he pretends, impoſſible.

Fourthly,) To put an end to the controverſy at once, this gentleman lets us into the ſecret, and gives the matter of fact in a true ſtate, *p. 66.* "The caſe in ſhort was this, ſaith he; there li-"ved in Dr. *Gaudens's* neighbourhood a *worthy* "clergyman; Mr. *Symmons* of *Raine* in *Eſſex*; "who was a chaplain to the prince, and in "great eſteem with the king, and on that account "the king truſted him with the conveyance of "his papers to the preſs. Dr. *Gauden* upon a "viſit, ſeeing theſe papers, begged to peruſe them, "and kept them long enough to take a tranſcript, "as was atteſted by his ſervant *William Allen*, "who ſet up a whole night with him, to ſnuff "his candles, and mend his fire. Mr. *Symmons* "dying long before the reſtoration, 'tis probable "Dr. *Gauden* might plead the merit of writing "this book, when he thought there were very "few, if any, perſons alive to diſprove it, or de-"tect the plagiary." I know nothing of this candle-ſnuffer, whom he repreſents as a perſon of credit; as he doth every one that talks for his purpoſe; but I muſt needs ſay, the ſtory looks as like a *mere ſtory*, fram'd to help out at a pinch, as can well be imagin'd. Two things are very obvious from it, as he tells it himſelf. *Firſt*, That Dr. *Gauden* muſt be a very great knave to go about to rob another man, *a king, a martyr*, (to whom he pretended ſo much affection and loyalty) of a work, that might have been ſo much for his honour and intereſt: *he ſaith, he did this when none were alive to detect him*; by which he repreſents

ſents the Dr. as void of all honour and conſcience, that could deliberately lye, and allow himſelf in any vile and baſe action, to promote his own intereſt, ſo he might eſcape undiſcovered among his neighbours. *Secondly*, Nor doth he make him a knave only, but a very weak man (a fool he allows one to call him) to ſit up all night, and fatigue his poor candle-ſnuffer, honeſt *William Allen*, to tranſcribe a book, that he knew was going to the preſs (for he ſaith it was in Mr. *Symmons*'s hands for that purpoſe) and that he might reaſonably expect to ſee in print in a ſhort time. Story-makers ſhould have a little more art than is ſhewn upon this occaſion, and contrive them ſo, that they may hang better together: I ſhall only farther remark, that this ſame tale, concerning Mr. *Symmons*, is told by Dr. *Hollingworth*, from whom, I ſuppoſe, Mr. *Wellwiſher* borrow'd it, and is anſwered by Dr. *Walker*. *p.* 14. Who ſaith, " that before the Εἰκὼν Βασιλικὴ was " thought of, or many of the ſubjects had hap- " pened, of which it treats, Mr. *Symmons* was " ſequeſtered, and one Mr. *Atkins* placed in his " living at *Rayne*; which proves the ſtory can't " *poſſibly* be true."

Fifthly,) The gentleman asks, " could Dr. *Gau-* " *den* be a friend to the king and parliament (whoſe " intereſt were ſo diametrically oppoſite to each " other) could he write for the one, and preach " for the other, at the ſame point of time?" *p.* 66. I know not whether he deſigns this as one of his demonſtrations, that Dr. *Gauden* could not be the author of that book: however he makes it the ground of a very common charge againſt me, (*viz.*) of contradiction: " I beg to know, " ſaith he, *p.* 65. How far our author is con- " ſiſtent

" ſiſtent with himſelf; he telling us, in the very " ſame paragraph, how much Dr. *Gauden* was in " the intereſt of the parliament, and yet wrote " for the king at the ſame time." But worthy Sir! do I ſay, that at the ſame time, when he was in the intereſt of the parliament, he wrote for the king? What I ſay is, " that he was in- " clinable to the parliaments ſide, and obliged them " by preaching before them; but *afterwards* (not " at the ſame point of time) when he found " the parliament went beyond their firſt intentions, " he endeavoured to redeem his error, by writing the " εἰκὼν βασιλικὴ, as Dr. *Walker*, the author I there " quote *, informs us." And what inconſiſtency is there in this? ſhould a boy at ſchool, where good diſcipline is obſerved, thus trifle, he would ſcarce eſcape with a whole skin.

And thus I have conſidered the reaſoning and arguments our author, after his excellent and ingenious writers, has employed in defence of his point, (*viz.*) to prove, that king *Charles*, and not Dr. *Gauden*, was the writer of εἰκὼν βασιλικὴ: how ſtrong and concluſive they are, I leave the reader to judge; which I might do without any further diſcourſe: however as this gentleman hath engaged me in the controverſy, I ſhall offer ſomething on the other ſide, to make it probable Dr. *Gauden* was the author of this book. And as Dr. *Walker* ought, in juſtice, to be eſteemed the beſt authority in the caſe, in as much as his teſtimony is founded, as he aſſures us, upon his own certain knowledge of facts, I ſhall moſtly confine my ſelf to his account of the matter; which in ſhort is

* *Memor. p.* 238.

" this:

this: "That being a friend and intimate of Dr. "*Gauden*'s, and living in his family, Dr. *Gauden*, "whilſt he was writing the book, and before it "was finiſhed, was pleaſed to acquaint him with the "deſign, and ſhew him the heads of ſeveral "chapters, and what he had wrote upon them: "after a peruſing them, Dr. *Gauden* asked him "his opinion concerning it: he told him, he "doubted not it would be for the king's repu-"tation, but ſtuck at the lawfulneſs of it; and "modeſtly asked him, how he ſatisfied himſelf, "thus to impoſe on the world? he anſwered, "look on the title, *'tis the pourtraiture*, &c. and "no man draws his own picture. Some time after "Dr. *Gauden* took him, (Mr. *Walker*) with him "to *London*, and to make a viſit to Dr. *Duppa*, "biſhop of *Salisbury*, where he ſhewed the bi-"ſhop what he had written (having before ac-"quainted him with the deſign): as they re-"turned home, Dr. *Gauden* communicated to "Mr. *Walker* what paſſed between him, and the "biſhop of *Salisbury*; and particularly told him, "that the biſhop ſaid there were two ſubjects "more, he wiſh'd he had thought on, (*viz.*) "the ordinance againſt the common prayer, and "the denying his majeſty his chaplains; which "at firſt he deſired him to write two chapters "upon; but, before they parted, undertook to do "it himſelf, and deſired him to go on, and fi-"niſh what remained. After the king was mur-"dered, upon Mr. *Walker*'s asking the Dr. whe-"ther the king had ſeen the book, he told him "he knew not certainly, but he had ſent it to "the king at the iſle of *Wight*, by the *Marquis* "of *Hartford*; that the duke of *York* knew of it, "and had ſpoken of it to him, (Dr. *Gauden*)

"as

" as a ſeaſonable and acceptable ſervice, that Mrs. " *Gauden*, himſelf, and others of the family al- " ways ſpoke of it, in his preſence and abſence, " as his book; being as much aſſur'd of it, as they " could be of any ſuch fact; that the Dr. de- " liver'd to him with his own hand, the laſt " part (after part was printed, or at leaſt in *Roy-* " *ſton*'s hand to be printed) giving him caution " with what warineſs to deliver it; and accord- " ingly he deliver'd it, *Saturday December* the " 23*d* to one *Peacock*, who was inſtructed by what " hands he ſhould deliver it to *Royſton*; and in " the ſame way, and by the hands of Mr. *Pea-* " *cock*, when the impreſſion was finiſhed, he " received ſix books, as an acknowlegment of his " ſervice." He farther declares, that he's perſuaded it was the writing this book (which he ſuppoſes biſhop *Duppa*, who was not only privy to the whole matter, but a party in it, acquainted king *Charles* with) that procur'd him the promiſe of the biſhoprick of *Wincheſter*. It appears from ſeveral papers publiſhed in the pamphlet, call'd *truth brought to light*, that the Dr. had an expectation of that preferment, and ſought for it, and that this was the merit pleaded in his behalf, to entitle him to ſo great favour. Among theſe papers are ſeveral letters to ſecretary *Nicholas*, the lord *Chancellor Hyde*, &c. and one from the lord *Chancellor* to Dr. *Gauden*, taking notice of the ſecret imparted to him, concerning which he ſaith, that *when it ceaſeth to be a ſecret, it will pleaſe none but Mr.* Milton. There is alſo a long narrative of Mrs. *Gauden*'s, ſhewing that her husband wrote the book: the narrative ſets forth, " that after " her husband had finiſhed the book, he ſhewed " it to the lord *Capel*, who approved it, and " was for printing it; but wiſhed the king might

" have a ſight of it; and accordingly it was ſent to " the king at the iſle of *Wight*, and that his " majeſty well liked it: that dangers haſtening " on the king, her husband having kept a copy " of it by him, ſent it to the preſs, and the " work was finiſhed a few days after his ma- " jeſty's death: that when it was publiſhed, her " husband, conceiving himſelf in danger, fled to " Sir *John Wentworth*'s near *Yarmouth*, intending " to paſs the ſeas; but the meſſenger he ſent the " book by, not being taken and examined, and " it not being known that her husband was con- " cerned in it (the letter, which had been taken, " and which he ſent with the book to *Royſton* " the printer, having no name to it) he altered " his purpoſe, and returned home: that after the " king's reſtoration, Dr. *Morley* told her husband " that his merit was ſuch, that he could ask no- " thing but he ſhould receive it; that biſhop " *Duppa* of *Wincheſter* being ſick, her husband went " to the king, and acquainted him, that he was " the author of εἰκὼν βασιλικὴ· for the truth of " which he appealed to biſhop *Duppa*, and made " an apology for printing it without his majeſty's " father's order, or his; but pleaded the circum- " ſtances of time, and the king's danger: his " majeſty ſaid, he thought it was his fa- " ther's, yet wondered how he could have time; " and obſerv'd it was wrote, *like a ſcholar as* " *well as a king*, and ſaid, that if it had been " publiſhed ſooner, it might have ſaved his fa- " ther's life; that at the ſame time the king gave " him the promiſe of the biſhoprick of *Win-* " *cheſter*." And Dr. *Walker* tells us from the biſhop himſelf, how much the king was after- wards ſtreightned, when the biſhoprick became va- cant, and he applied to him for it, between his

word

word of honour to Dr. *Gauden*, on the one hand, and the importunity of a great man at court in behalf of Dr. *Morley*; ſo that this narrative, found among biſhop *Gauden*'s papers, and written by Mrs. *Gauden*'s own hand, with the other letters referred to above, together with what Dr. *Walker* has publiſhed on his own certain knowledge, ſeem to unravel the whole myſtery, and I think, are ſufficient to clear the queſtion, *who wrote the εἰκὼν βασιλική.*

I ſhall only remark a few things upon Dr. *Walker*'s account of the matter, and give the reader no further trouble upon this ſubject; as *Firſt*, That what he delivers is not founded upon conjectures, hear-ſay, and uncertain report, but upon the teſtimony of the biſhop himſelf, and his own knowledge: the biſhop acquainted him with his deſign, ſhew'd him the ſeveral chapters whilſt he was drawing them up, and asked him his opinion of the undertaking, as related above. *Secondly*, That he was a zealous loyaliſt, and expreſſed great tenderneſs on all occaſions for king *Charles*'s memory and character. "I ſhould rejoice, ſaith he, to find the title of the Dr,'s "book (*Hollinworth*'s vindication) made good, as "near as poſſible, worthy of that excellent king "of happy memory, whoſe honour I believe is "better ſecur'd by the reputation of his acknowledg'd wiſdom, celebrated virtues, exemplary "and chriſtian magnanimity in his ſufferings, "than by ſuch defenders." *p.* 1, 2. Elſewhere he declares the reaſon why he had occaſionally before, and now more at large diſcovered the real author of this book; *negatively*, "not to "rob the excellent king of any honour due to "him; adding, no man of my ſtation loving

" him better, or honouring him more, while he " lived, or more abhorring his murder, or be- " wailing his death; or in my ſtation giving " more open teſtimony againſt it; or ſuſtain- " ing greater loſs for ſo doing: but I need not " vindicate my ſelf in a caſe, wherein I never " heard my ſelf accuſed or ſuſpected: but *poſi-* " *tively*, the reaſon why I have done what I " own, was becauſe, *as we muſt not ſpeak wickedly* " *for God, nor talk deceitfully for him*, Job i. 7. " neither may we do ſo for any man, for thoſe " that are called Gods. 'Tis an approved ſay- " ing of St. Auſtin, *An officious lye ought not to be* " *told to ſave the world:* and I can't deny but " there was more than the appearance of ſome " pious fraud in this affair, which I ſhould, by " my ſilence, have contributed to the maintaining " of, when I was required to ſpeak my know- " ledge of it; and, I confeſs, I have many cogent " reaſons to perſuade me, that God was not well " pleaſed with Dr. *Gauden*, and my ſelf, for what " we contributed to it, *p.* 35.";

Thirdly, He appeals to God for his integrity in the whole affair. " I ſolemnly appeal, ſaith " he, to the ſearcher of hearts, avenger of falſe- " hood, and revealer of ſecrets, that I will write " nothing, of the truth of which I am not " thoroughly perſuaded, *p.* 2." ſo that we have the teſtimony of one, who ſpoke what he knew, not what he heard from others, or infer- red from circumſtances; the teſtimony of a friend to the king, not an enemy; a royaliſt, not a republican or fanatick: and this teſtimony is in effect ratified by an oath; for he appeals to God as the ſearcher of hearts, and avenger of falſehood. I might add, *Fourthly*. This is the more con-

firm'd

firm'd by the weakneſs, inſufficiency and impertinency of the greateſt part of the allegations on the other ſide: as the letters patent to *Royſton*; the teſtimony of *Major Huntington*, which, if Dr. *Walker*'s word or oath may be believed, the *Major* denied he ever gave, in terms that amounted to a teſtimony; and only ſaid, when the book came out, *ſurely theſe muſt be the papers, I ſaw the king ſo frequently read*; though he owns, he never read one word of them himſelf. Of the like nature is the ſtory concerning Mr. *Levet*, in Dr. *Hollingworth*, "that while his ma-"jeſty was priſoner in the iſle of *Wight*, he "read over the book in his majeſty's bed-cham-"ber, writ with his majeſty's own hand, with "ſeveral interlinings, and that the king ſaid to "him, *Sure*, Levet, *you deſign to get this book by "heart.*" 'Tis much, I confeſs, that *Levet* ſhould be allowed ſo much freedom with the king's papers: though, if he really then ſaw, and read the book, 'tis no argument it was the king's; ſince Dr. *Gauden* had ſent it to the iſle of *Wight*, by the lord *Hartford*, as was ſaid before: and with the ſame good grace we are told, that Mrs. *Gauden* expreſſed a very great concern for the eternal ſtate of her husband, becauſe he pretended to be the author of this famous book, when to her knowledge he never writ it. This the reverend and learned Dr. *Hollingworth* ſaid he had, from a reverend and learned clergyman in *London*, who had it from a lady of good quality, (though he had forgot her name, and knows not who ſhe was) 16 Years ago*. Two little objections lie againſt this tale, *viz.* that

* Character of king *Charles* the *firſt*, &c. *p.* 10.

Mrs.

Mrs. *Gauden* conſtantly, for ought appears, except when ſhe talked with this unknown lady, talked in a different ſtrain, and afterwards often aſſerted her husband was the author of this book: and further it ſeems to me a prejudice againſt that lady's ſtory, that Mrs. *Gauden* is repreſented as fearing her husband was damn'd, for pretending to write a book, he did not write; whereas, at other times, ſhe never ſeem'd concern'd at her husband's prevaricating, in aſcribing a book to another man, which ſhe knew, he did not write. I can't ſee but according to this account, however the matter was, the poor woman muſt be in pain for her husband in the other world: either he did write the book, or he did not: if he did not, ſhe dreads to think what is become of him; for he lyed, pretending and maintaining he did: if he did, and really was the author of the book, it looks ſo like prevaricating, and lying, to put it out in the king's name, and pretend the king wrote it, that 'tis much it gave her no concern: but indeed the ſtory has all the marks of ſham and impoſture, that can well be thought of, and is inconſiſtent with what ſhe profeſs'd, and declar'd on all occaſions, as has been vouched by thoſe that knew her. 'Tis another pretty ſtory the Dr. gives us from Dr. *Dillingham* (*p.* 7.) "That while the king was at "*Holmeby*, one of the bed-chamber ſhewed "him the king's cloſet, wherein was his library "and papers; he ſeeing a black box on the ta- "ble, that was locked, *but not very cloſe*, ſpy'd "a corner of a paper hanging out, and took the "boldneſs to draw it ſo far out, as that he could read "ſeveral ſentences; and after ſaid, when he ſaw "the king's book in print, he found the very "ſame things, word for word (*as far as he could*

"*remember*)

" *remember*) with the manuſcript paper." Now theſe, and other ſuch like ſtories look ſo like fiſhing for evidence, and the ſhifts of credulous bewilder'd men, that would fain prove ſomething they deſire to believe, but know not how, that they ſeem to me to diſparage, and diſgrace the cauſe they are brought to ſerve. *It may be* the king's black box was in ſo mean a ſtate, as that it would not lock cloſe; and *it may be* this gentleman got hold of a corner of a page, and read a ſentence or two; but that he ſhould be able to know, that theſe were *the very ſame ſentences and words*, he afterwards ſaw in the printed book, requires ſuch a preparation and diſpoſition of mind, as our Drs. ſeem to have, to believe. This good man doth not pretend to ſay, what the words were, that he read; or to have any apprehenſion of the king's deſign, or what he was about: a conſiderable time paſſed between his peeping into the king's box, and the publiſhing the book; and it is much he ſhould ſo diſtinctly remember a ſentence or two, concerning he knew not what, as to conclude, they were the very ſame, he afterwards met with in print. Indeed this teſtimony, if one may call it ſo, is very lame and defective, as it is given us by themſelves. Dr. *Dillingham*'s ſon ſaith, that his father ſaid, that *as far as he could remember*, the words were the ſame: but how far he could, or could not remember, he doth not ſay, and how unlikely it is he ſhould remember to purpoſe, has been hinted.

But I have done with this debate, comparatively of no importance, and not worth half the pains that has often been taken about it, was it not for the uſe ſome men have made, and ſtill make of the matter: the king, they ſay, wrote

the

the book; *therefore* he was an excellent pious devout king, and *therefore* they were the vileſt miſcreants that oppoſed him; a conſequence I would utterly deny, ſhould I allow the premiſes: whoever the perſon was that wrote the book, I apprehend, the cauſe of thoſe that defended the liberties of their country at that time, would, in the main, be the ſame: nor ſhould I have ſaid ſo much on this, and other ſubjects in theſe papers, but to check the inſolence of ſome writers, or at leaſt to apologize againſt their railing accuſations: I leave the matter with the reader without further arguing: he has ſeen what is offered on one ſide, to prove the king the author of the book, and what reply has been made to it: whether this be ſufficient to ſet againſt the evidence on the other ſide; particularly the poſitive ſolemn teſtimony of thoſe, that ſay they knew Dr. *Gauden* wrote it, that liv'd with him, when he wrote it, were made acquainted with his deſign, ſaw it whilſt it was a-writing, and heard him own it on all occaſions among his friends, is referred to the reader's judgment.

Mr. *Wellwiſher* can't reaſonably find fault, if I take the ſame method in anſwering the reſt of his book, he has taken in anſwering the *Memorial*; caſt an eye now and then upon a few paſſages, as I ſee fit: if any reader ſhould complain (as it may be few will) I only deſire him to exerciſe as much patience, as I have done, in tracing ſuch another writer through as many dull pages, and then I ſhall ſubmit to his cenſure.

P. 68. Having quoted the *Memorial*, as commending the main body of the pariſh miniſters in *Oliver*'s time, for a ſerious ſenſe of religion, *&c.*

and

and declared himself sorry he cannot be of my opinion, he adds, " if by a serious sense of religion he had meant no more, than a bare pretence to " it, a form of godliness without the power thereof; or, as Sir *Roger L'Estrange* saith, if he " meant no more than preaching up treason and " blasphemy in the pulpit, the giving God thanks " for murder, and seizing by fraud another man's " office, and living, and refusing the communion " to any one refusing the covenant; herein I " could readily agree with him:" and after uttering so much good sense, charity and truth, partly in his own words, and partly in worthy Sir *Roger*'s, he subjoins, " but if he mean their acting " conformably to their duty towards God, their " neighbour, and themselves, I beg leave to dissent " from him;" and then brings in the remarkable FOR, " FOR I find this character given of them " by one," (quoting Mr. *Edward*'s *Gangræna*). I am weary, I confess, of answering such reasons, or rather raving, and am inclined to let this gentleman talk as he pleases, for the future, and as a disturbed imagination prompts him; otherwise I might ask him, what force his FOR has here? how does Mr. *Edward*'s giving a different character of the parish ministers of that time, disprove the character I had given? might I not as well argue, that king *Charles* was not the author of the εικὼν βασιλικὴ, FOR Mr. *Toland* saith he was not? I might also ask, whether Mr. *Edwards* is not speaking of one sort of men, and I of another? I say, the main body of the parish ministers were so, and so: no, saith he, I dissent from him, FOR Mr. *Edwards* gives this character of the *sectaries*. A weak and confused head, I know, will reason very sillily, when no harm is meant; which is the best excuse I can

make for him here, and the only plea againſt the charge of deſigned prevarication. Mr. *Edwards*, as our author quotes him, ſaith, " there never was a " more diſſembling hypocritical generation of men, " than many of the grandees of our ſectaries; and " elſewhere, that in ſettling religion, ſome threw " out the articles of faith, ſome all the command- " ments, ſome the holy ſcriptures, ſome the office " and calling of miniſters, ſome the Lord's ſupper, " others baptiſm, and all ordinances." And this he applies to the body of the pariſh miniſters, and grounds an argument, upon Mr. *Edwards*'s authority, to prove they were not ſuch perſons as I had repreſented them; when he knows (at leaſt a child might know) Mr. *Edwards* doth not intend the body of the pariſh miniſters at that time, but ſectaries and ſeparatiſts: and indeed 'tis ſtrange any man ſhould have a front to inſinuate, as this worthy perſon doth, that in ſettling religion at that time, they threw out the creed, commandments, ſacraments, holy ſcripture, *&c.* Did the parliament, the aſſembly thus ſettle religion? is there any thing of this in the directory? or did the pariſh miniſters then profeſs, and practice according to this ſcheme? what if any one ſhould ſay there are certain perſons, falſe diſſembling men, among the parochial clergy at this time, that maintain paſſive obedience, non-reſiſtence, the indefeaſible hereditary right of kings; doctrines perfectly inconſiſtent with the preſent government, who yet have taken oaths to it; that aſſert the abſolute neceſſity of epiſcopal ordination and baptiſm, in order to ſalvation, in the way of God's covenant; that maintain it eſſential to the euchariſt, that the wine be mixed with water, that the ſacrament is a proper ſacrifice, and that we ought to pray for the dead,

with

with the like ſchiſmatical, and enthuſiaſtick principles; would it not be injurious, to impute this to the body of the pariſh miniſters, and to affirm that the church of *England* included ſuch ſtuff in the ſettlement of religion: and yet this is no worſe than what Mr. *Welhwiſher* has done, with reference to the perſons I was ſpeaking of, applying to them what is notoriouſly falſe, and what his author intended of others.

Our author afterwards touches the presbyterian, and popiſh plots, in king *Charles* the *ſecond*'s reign, and undertakes to prove the former was real, the latter a ſham; denies the perſecution of the presbyterians in *Scotland*, and gravely tells us, (*p.* 72.) "That if any ſeverity was uſed, it was but the "inflicting *legal puniſhment*;" and I ſhall leave him to enjoy his own fancies, and not diſturb the pleaſure of his dreams: (*p.* 80.) He comes to king *James* the *ſecond*'s reign; and here he ſaith, "I think, the hiſtorian bears too hard upon the "character, and misfortunes of that unhappy and "miſguided prince, who was precipitately hurried "on by ſome of his miniſtry (who 'tis plain, were "far from being his friends) into *inconveniences*, "out of which he could never extricate himſelf." Wonderful tenderneſs and ſympathy! the very ſame thing was ſaid of king *James*'s meaſures at *Rome*: they thought, as did others of his friends here, that he went on too faſt, and precipitated himſelf into inconveniences, as good Mr. *Welhwiſher* expreſſeth it. What is in my worthy friend's mind, I don't pretend to know; but he ſeems, by the ſtrain of his talk, to regret that unhappy prince's diſappointment, and to find fault with his proceedings, only becauſe they were raſh and precipitate, and ſo

proved unſuccesful. I don't charge this upon him; but it is no injury to him to ſay, he ſpeaks like one of ſuch ſentiments. I ſhall only further obſerve here, that the gentleman has not one good word to ſay of king *William* and his government, (any more than of king *George*) I don't remember that he mentions it, but in *p.* 72. with a deſign to reproach it with the ſtory of the lords of *Glencow*; (which, as our author often ſaith on other occaſions, has been anſwered again and again to the ſatisfaction of all unprejudiced perſons) I had complained of the barbarities acted towards the presbyterians in *Scotland*, in king *Charles*'s reign; upon which he remarks, "that I ſtigmatize the inflicting legal puniſhments with a deteſtable name, "little conſidering what an inhumane part was acted in another reign, to the poor *Macdonalds*, lords "of *Glencow*, after a promiſe given of ſecurity:" where he inſinuates, that if there were any ſeverities exerciſed, they were neceſſary; that king *Charles* kept within bounds of law; nor doth he find fault with king *James*, as tranſgreſſing in this reſpect: but for king *William* he acted an inhumane part, and violated his promiſe; which if it was true, as 'tis utterly falſe (ſo far as the king was concerned in it) did not king *James* do ſo too? did he not violate his word and oath? and yet the one is only bewail'd (with great ſympathy) as unſuccesful, precipitated into *inconveniences*, (as they proved to himſelf, ah! alaſs!) whilſt the other is trampled under foot as a tyrant! if the eſtabliſhed church have no more hearty *Welhuiſhers* than this author, *domine miſerere*; for my ſelf I muſt needs ſay, the name of an honeſt nonjuror is venerable, compar'd with ſuch men.

P. 81.

P. 81. He undertakes to disprove what was said in the *Memorial*, *p.* 400. *That the church of* England *neither desired, nor would accept of the help of the dissenters (in the* popish *controversies.)* Nor indeed do I know how 'tis possible for me, to prove any thing to his satisfaction, that he's not dispos'd to believe: if I produce my authorities, and he can find any on the other side, he has an art of criticism, by the help of which, he can ruin all my evidence, how strong soever it might appear to me; (*viz.*) that his authors are authentick, worthy, excellent, *&c.* and mine republicans, infamous bigots, *&c.* The best of it is, this gentleman often mistakes his own authors, and blunders in the use he makes of them; brings them in to disprove facts, when they say nothing to the purpose: something of this is observable in the present case: to prove that the dissenters offered no books against popery to be licens'd, and that none were refus'd license, he gives us a letter from Dr. *Isham*, one of the licensers of the press: what the Dr. saith with reference to the matter is, " that he remembers not so much as one " book against popery, among all the dissenters, that " was brought to him for his hand, in the reign " of king *James.*" Our author tells us there are other letters, to the same purpose, from Dr. *Aston*, Dr. *Batley*, and Mr. *Needham*, all concerned as licensers for the press: I grant there is something that looks plausible in this, more so than in most of his exceptions; he thinks the evidence against me so entire, as to warrant the pronouncing the fact false (he means what I published as fact) he adds, it " ought, in justice" to be retracted by our historian *p.* 83. And I can assure him, I should find no difficulty in retracting any mistake, that he, or any one else shall convince me of; but in the present

ſent caſe I am not convinced, and do not think he has offered ſufficient matter of conviction. *Firſt*, For the teſtimonies of theſe Doctors (the licenſers for the preſs) is defective: he gives us the words but of one of them that (he intimates indeed that the reſt wrote to the very ſame purpoſe, *p.* 83.) and he, Dr. *Iſham*, only ſaith, *he doth not remember* that one book of the diſſenters was brought to him: whether the reſt ſpeak more poſitively, or not, I cannot determine; if they do, I fancy he would have produced their expreſſions. *Secondly*, He doth not tell us, that theſe were the only perſons concerned in licencing, during the reign of king *James*; if they were not, others might have diſſenters books offered to them, and refuſe them, whatever they did, *Thirdly*, I own the diſſenters did not publiſh many books about popery at that time, for which I made an apology for them in the *Memorial*, which our author takes no notice of, only ſingles out a paſſage of it to carp at. I ſhall ſubjoin the apology as it there ſtands, *p.* 399. "It "has, I know, been often caſt in the teeth of the "diſſenters, that they were ſilent at this danger- "ous and critical juncture; but I am ſatisfyed "ſuch as impute it to coolneſs, with reference to "the cauſe depending, and indifference about po- "pery, or a cowardly temporizing, very much wrong "them; they were glad to ſee the work in ſo good "hands, and the controverſy managed, to ſo good "purpoſe, by their proteſtant brethren of the church "of *England:* they thought it but reaſonable, to "leave them to lay the devil, they had done ſo "much, many of them, to raiſe; and rejoiced to "ſee them ſo vigorouſly endeavour it; and be- "ſides, it ſhould be remembered, that the diſſen- "ters were but juſt come out of gaols and priſons;

"a little

" a little while ago they durſt ſcarce ride along the
" king's high way, for fear of a church of *Eng-*
" *land* purſuivant: their papers were rifled, books
" and goods plundered; and what wonder, if men
" in ſuch circumſtances were no great writers: how
" ſhould they trace the popiſh juglers through the
" fathers and councils, that had, ſome of them, few
" books left, except the bible and pilgrim's pro-
" greſs, *&c.* but after all, there's too much reaſon
" to ſay, the church of *England*, neither deſired, nor
" would accept their help. Mr. *Hanmer*, a learned
" diſſenter, and well skilled in antiquity, had pre-
" pared a diſcourſe againſt the whole ſyſtem of po-
" pery, which was refuſed licence, as was Mr. *Pen-*
" *dlebury*'s diſcourſe againſt tranſubſtantiation; tho'
" Dr. *Tillotſon* recommended it, and uſed his en-
" deavours to get it printed; nay, it is ſaid, it
" was offered that Mr. *Baxter* ſhould produce a
" piece againſt popery every month, if a licenſe
" might be had; but this motion was rejected with
" ſcorn; and indeed every thing undertaken by a
" diſſenter blown upon: ſo that, all things conſi-
" dered, it is leſs difficulty to apologize for the diſ-
" ſenters in this matter, than to defend the honour
" of ſome of their brethren," I ſhall make no ad-
ditions here, only obſerve, ſuitably to the argument
I am upon, that ſince the diſſenters, for the rea-
ſons aſſigned, wrote few books, Dr. *Iſham* might
ſay, *he doth not remember one* was offered to him;
and yet this is no proof they wrote none, and that
none were refuſed licence. *Fourthly*, It is a known
and certain thing, that the diſſenters then, and at
other times, met with diſcouragement and difficul-
ty, in publiſhing their books. I have authority for
the inſtances in the *Memorial*; and have been told,
a tract of Mr. *Samuel Chandler*'s againſt popery had
the

the ſame treatment, and could not obtain licence: even their practical writings could ſcarce paſs muſter, and ſeldom got to the preſs without being curtailed. A friend, whoſe veracity and intelligence I have no reaſon to queſtion, informs me, that Dr. *Bates*'s harmony, though recommended by dean *Tillotſon*, could hardly obtain an *imprimatur*. *Jonathan Robinſon* the bookſeller, attended Dr. *Hooper* (the arch-biſhop's chaplain) a great many times at *Lambeth* about it, and was continually put off with words to this purpoſe, "It is a critical time, and though "this be a good book, yet there are ſome things "ſaid, relating to the jewiſh diſpenſation, that may "give offence to ſome in the church." After a tireſome waiting, and ſubmitting to have it altered, where it was found fault with, Dr. *Hooper* licenſed it; but with ſo cold a recommendation, that the bookſeller thought it for his intereſt not to publiſh the words of it: now, as I apprehend this to have been the ſtate of the caſe, *that ſome of the diſſenters books were abſolutely rejected, others caſtrated, and all looked upon with an evil eye* (which muſt needs be a diſcouragement from writing much) as I believe this to be fact, I cannot gratify this gentleman, and retract upon his admonition.

His labour and zeal in vindication of *Sacheverel*, *Bedford*, *Greenſhields*, and the *Jacobite* mobs, in the latter end of the laſt reign, and beginning of this, I do not envy, and ſhall not diſturb: ſhall only obſerve, that the account I gave of the *Oxford* mob, *p.* 498. he thinks, I my ſelf can't believe; and for conviction asks, "whether I eſteem the "teſtimony of an officer, (Major *D' Offranvil*) "and probably of one, whoſe character may not "be the freeſt from exception in all other reſpects,

"or

" or the teſtimony of the worthy vice-chancellour, " *&c.* the moſt credible" *p.* 92. But how do I know that the one of theſe gentlemen was worthy, and the other unworthy? our author diſcovers too much partiality towards *Jacobite* mobs and incendiaries, to be truſted in his characters: whether he endeavours to diſparage the major's account, that he gives of the riot, and leſſen his credit, becauſe he appeared in favour of the government, and ſhew'd a zeal for the honour of the royal family, I ſhall not ſay; but if one may judge, from the repreſentation he has given of himſelf in this book, there is reaſon enough to ſuſpect it: but after all, I did not depend merely on the major's teſtimony: the matter was brought under examination both by a commitee of council, and a committee of the houſe of lords; and both, after examination, declar'd in favour of the major, and his account, as may be ſeen, *Memorial, p.* 499. Now I might ask this worthy man in his own words, " which of the two accounts, even he himſelf, " laying aſide prejudice, would eſteem moſt cre- " dible;" that of the officer's, confirmed by a committee of the lords of the council, and of the parliament; or that of the vice-chancellor and mayor, who at that very time, were under ſuſpicion of diſaffection to the government, and were accuſed of it? I do not, I confeſs, ſtay for an anſwer; for I doubt not it will readily come into his head, that this major was a whig, or a republican major, and the lords whig lords; and if ſo, I know what their ſentence muſt be. But I ſhall take leave of Mr. *Wellwiſher* and his perſormance. I deſign'd a few remarks upon it in general, and the manner and tendency of this and ſuch like writings, ſo full of the ſpirit of ſchiſm, faction and the worſt

of ſcandals; but I ſhall give my ſelf, and the reader no further trouble, though I break off abruptly.

I am fully aſſur'd God will preſerve the chriſtian church, in the midſt of all dangers; greatly hope he'll defend the proteſtant intereſt, and cauſe of the reformation in theſe nations, againſt all the deſigns and attempts of perfidious men; reſcue the church of *England* particularly out of the hands of impoſtors, and in due time, by an eminent effuſion of the ſpirit of holineſs, peace and love, revive religion among us, that *glory may dwell in our land.*

FINIS.

BOOKS Printed for, and ſold by J. Morley at the *Croſs-Keys*, in the *Poultry*.

CAſſiodorii ſenatoris complexiones in epiſtolas, & acta apoſtolorum & apocalypſin. E vetuſtiſſimis canonicorum Veronenſium membranis nuper erutœ. Editio altera. Ad Florentinam fideliter expreſſa. Opera & cura *Samuelis Chandleri*.

A Caveat againſt the pretender, being a ſhort but impartial hiſtory of ſome of the aſſaſſinations, murthers, *&c.* committed by *papiſts* upon proteſtants, with a particular account of the maſſacre of *Ireland* and *Paris*, and of the bloody inquiſition; and alſo an eſtimate of the proportion of lands of the nation, formerly poſſeſſed by the church of *Rome*, and which would again be in their hands, ſhould popery return. To which is premiſed ſome account of *popiſh* principles, ſhewing that they neceſſarily lead to all this barbarity; and particularly, that if ever a *popiſh* prince uſurp the *Britiſh* throne, he is bound by all that is ſacred, to extirpate and deſtroy his proteſtant ſubjects, upon pain of damnation.

Occaſional hymns, chiefly for the Lord's day, and Lord's table, being a collection from others, with an addition of new hymns. Theſe two by *B. Bennet*.

Practical

Practical diſcourſes concerning the chriſtian temper, being thirty eight ſermons upon the principal heads of practical religion, eſpecially as enjoined and inforced by chriſtianity. In two volumes, deſigned for the uſe of families. By *John Evans.*

Some thoughts upon the ſacrament, which ſet that matter, in the ſeveral particulars of it, in an eaſier and juſter light than uſual; and correct ſome miſtakes which enſlave, and terrify the minds of chriſtians upon that occaſion. In a letter to a friend. By *W. Jacomb.*

The aſcent of the ſeparate ſoul. A poem. In miltonick verſe.

Our preſent health and ſafety owing entirely to the mercies of God. A ſermon preached at *Black-Fryars* on the day of thankſgiving for our preſervation from the plague, *April.* 25. 1723. By *S. Wright.* With an appendix, containing a brief account of all the plagues which have prevailed in *England* the laſt four hundred years.

Meetneſs for the heavenly glory a juſt reaſon for thankſgiving unto God. A funeral ſermon, occaſioned by the much lamented death of Mrs. *Mary Dolins*, who died *Feb.* 15. 1719. With an account of her exemplary character. By *Daniel Mayo*, M. A.

The trees and the bramble: Or a *popiſh* prince, certain deſtruction to a proteſtant people. By *Jaſper How*, of *Penryn Cornwall.*